

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Monday, February 8, 1988

The House met at 12 noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Bless all people, gracious God, who seek to honor You by honoring those with whom they live or work. Enable us to see that we ought to praise You and respect the people about us. May the love we offer You, O God, be translated into affection and concern and care for every person. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

MAKING IN ORDER ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 17, 1988, ONE MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES, NOTWITHSTANDING THE SPEAKER'S APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 5, SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 1987

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the Speaker's appointment of conferees on H.R. 5, that one motion to instruct conferees be in order on Wednesday, February 17, 1988.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

MEDAL TO COMMEMORATE COAST GUARD BICENTENNIAL

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ANNUNZIO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANNUNZIO. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to design, strike, and sell a commemorative medal honoring the bicentennial of the U.S. Coast Guard in 1990. The Revenue Cutter Service, the forerunner of the Coast Guard, was established in 1790. The Cutter Service was developed primarily to assist the Department of the Treasury in the enforcement and payment of customs and tonnage duties. Not even a decade passed before these duties were dramatically expanded to include assisting the U.S. Navy in the defense of the country. Since those early days, the responsibilities of the service have continued to evolve and increase.

The Coast Guard has been involved in virtually every conflict in which U.S. military forces have been engaged, and stands ready at all

times to join in protecting this country. Using several amphibious vehicles at Guadalcanal, the Coast Guard participated in a mission to extract marines from the shore where they were trapped by Japanese gunfire. Amid the spray of bullets, signalman, first class, Douglas Munro maneuvered his vehicle to a position between the marines and his fellow coast guardsmen. His quick and decisive action distracted the enemy fire, allowing for the safe rescue of all of the marines. Munro lost his life in this effort. He was posthumously awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor.

While this extraordinary act of heroism has been appropriately commended, I believe that all Coast Guard personnel are deserving of the distinction which my proposed medal will bring. On daily patrol on Long Island during World War II, Coast Guard seaman, second class, John C. Cullen came upon four suspicious individuals. Recognizing that they were in danger of being caught, the individuals bribed Cullen to keep quiet. Cullen played along, pretending to accept the bribe, and immediately returned to his base to report the incident. Cullen's skill and calm demeanor led to the capture of four German saboteurs who had come ashore from a German submarine.

The crucial responsibility of aiding the national defense does not overshadow the myriad of duties which the Coast Guard undertakes daily. Among these are assisting the Customs Service in the war against drugs, providing education programs for boating safety, performing rescue operations at sea, and striving to protect marine environments.

In 1896, for example, a schooner with nine people aboard was driven aground during a hurricane near the Outer Banks of North Carolina. Waves crashed against the vessel, breaking it into pieces and threatening the lives of those aboard. The men of the Pea Island Life-saving Station formed a human chain and waded through the tumultuous waters, saving the captain, his crew of six, his wife and 3-year-old child.

The work of the Coast Guard has been, and continues to be, an integral factor in protecting individuals and our Nation as a whole. As I speak today, the Coast Guard is attempting to contain an oil spill in the Rosario Straits off of Anacortes, WA. A barge sank on Sunday, January 31, 1988, carrying 384,000 gallons of oil which could be disastrous to the marine environment and to the surrounding area. The multifaceted role of the Coast Guard in this type of situation includes efforts to prevent harm to people, marine life, and nearby communities.

These examples illustrate the important roles that the Coast Guard performs for our country. In 1975, the Congress passed legislation commemorating medals honoring the bicentennials of the U.S. Army, Navy, and Marines. I believe that the valuable work of the men and women of the Coast Guard, both past and present, equally merit this honor.

I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this legislation. Under the rules of the Subcommittee on Consumer Affairs and Coinage, any medal bill must be cosponsored by at least 218 Members before it may be considered. Members may join me as a cosponsor by calling the subcommittee at extension 6-3280.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my special order might come before that of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

IT IS TIME FOR PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, "courage is grace under pressure." That was Ernest Hemingway's definition and for a generation that definition fit Israel and its leadership to a tee.

The creation of Israel is one of the remarkable stories of the postwar era. For the world, that event in 1948 represented the collective recognition of its responsibility for the attention, blindness, and neglect that led to the systematic destruction of millions of innocent and defenseless human beings in the Holocaust.

For Jews, it represented the culmination of efforts to finally establish a homeland, a place to call their own, a nation that could provide a secure life without relying upon the sometimes wanting actions of other peoples and other societies.

As a young teenager who was just beginning to be conscious of world events, I viewed David Ben-Gurion and others of and after his time as representing the Western ideal-philosopher statesmen who were strong enough to fight, and moral enough to never lose sight of their own humanity, even as they fought the fight.

Anyone who watched Israeli leadership forge a society based on humane values and democratic institutions, anyone who was familiar with the crucial and leading role of American Jews in building and protecting those same values and institutions here at home, could feel little but gratitude for their role in making the world and in

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

making our own country a more enlightened and civilized place.

But as is the case with virtually any great event in history, the creation of the State of Israel created problems and dilemmas for others—namely, the Palestinians who lived in the territory to be known as Israel.

Those dilemmas lead the Arab world to a mistaken decision to meet the creation of the State of Israel with a military effort to overthrow "on the ground" the partition of Palestine that defined the borders of the new state. They lost.

As a human being I can understand the emotions that lead them to that decision, just as I can understand the emotions that lead the world's Jews to demand the creation of Israel. But if the future is to be better than the past for millions of human beings in that region, after 40 years of history, it makes no more sense for Arabs to refuse to recognize the permanent existence of Israel than it does for Chinese nationalists to refuse to recognize the permanent existence of the People's Republic of China.

History creates competing rights and competing forces. It eventually makes choices and creates realities. Both realities are here to stay.

In the Middle East, I believe the moral obligation of the United States, ever since it played the leading role in the creation of Israel, has been to remain steadfast to that commitment. That remains true through today; it will be true in the future. But with that obligation comes a concurrent obligation to help shape events in the Middle East in a way that encourages policies on the part of all people in that area which maximizes opportunities for justice and minimize the chance for tragedy and conflict.

Mr. Speaker, when I remind myself of the constant pressure under which Israel has had to function—six wars, continuing terrorist attacks, continuing "Israel bashing" in the United Nations, the lack of recognition by all countries in the region except one—I am in awe of the durability of its democratic institutions and its democratic spirit. But, Mr. Speaker, 40 years of pressure can diminish the resilience of individuals and societies alike, leaving each with a reduced capacity to seek creative solutions to excruciating problems. Certainly that pressure has taken its toll on Israel. Israel's capacity to defend its military interests is stronger than ever. But its capacity to maintain the civic values it has always stood for has been frayed.

The refusal of the Arab world to negotiate directly with Israel about the Mid-East's future, and the strain of confronting the Palestinian dilemma have slowly polarized and rigidified Israel's domestic debate about how to deal with both problems. The price of constant military vigilance has added

to that strain and narrowed Israel's ability to think through choices with its eye on the long view.

And now the West Bank and Gaza have exploded into violence.

Palestinians, many of them children, have engaged in protests on an unprecedented scale in order to protest their continuing status within the occupied territories. Israel's reaction to that explosion has left many Palestinians dead, many more of them beaten, hospitalized or jailed, and some of them under threat of deportation. What we have seen and heard has often been appalling.

Mr. Speaker, in reacting to the frustration and brutality of past weeks, we must—in the interest of fairness, and in the interest of giving accurate guidance to that action—place what we have seen and heard in perspective.

As serious and appalling as some of the incidences have been, measured by deaths actually inflicted, they pale by comparison to examples of other recent brutalities in the Middle East. The killing of thousands by Syria in the Hama massacre and the killing of Palestinians in Lebanon by Amal are two examples. So too are the numerous examples of terrorists attacks on innocent women and children by PLO forces.

But placing recent events in perspective does not remove the obligation to try to stop the killing and the brutality.

Mr. Speaker, America cannot determine the conduct of Israeli, Palestinian, or Arab individuals, governments or movements. But we do, as the principal guarantor of Western values, as the leader of the Western alliance, and as the most important friend and supporter of Israel, have a special obligation to affect events in a way that will do three things:

First, maximize justice;

Second, help a friend; and

Third, avoid the unraveling of what stability there is in the Middle East, before that unraveling threatens Western interests in that part of the world.

We must display a maximum commitment to use all of the influence and wisdom we can muster to move Israel and its Arab neighbors to meaningful negotiations about both short- and long-term changes that will assure Israel's security and bring a just and humane approach to resolving the Palestinian plight. Weak action or inaction on our part is no favor to anyone; it is simply a guarantee that all of us will slide further into tragedy.

We cannot afford to let the excuse of American and Israeli elections interfere with that duty. That effort will take time, but it must be sustained with intensity now, next week, next month, and for as long as it takes. It will mean a continuing willingness to be firm with Israel and with every

Arab party. We owe it to our own conscience and we owe it to our friends in the region to proceed.

And, Mr. Speaker, we should immediately, tomorrow, insist with all the force of commitment we can display that Israel not follow through on the intention announced by housing administrator Levy to break ground on three Israeli settlements near Arab villages on the West Bank. It would be the height of irresponsibility to throw gasoline on Palestinian passions and we must insist that announcement not be implemented.

Mr. Speaker, there are some who object to any criticism of Israeli policy or to the questioning of any increased financial commitment to Israel in a time of Gramm-Rudman imposed scarcity. Mr. Speaker, that is nonsense.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that the Palestinian problem and the continuing existence of Palestinian refugee camps has not been caused by Israel alone. Its Arab neighbors have been willing to continue a situation which keeps those camps as a visible reminder of the issue rather than providing help to relocate through inhabitants in order to bring them a better life.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Foreign Operations and Export Assistance Appropriation Subcommittee, I have supported administration requests for large amounts of aid—economic and military—to Israel because I recognize our obligation to help defend a nation we helped create, with whom we share Western values, and of whom we asked much during the Camp David negotiations. My commitment to that obligation remains inviolate, as does my respect for the tremendous force for good that has been represented by the American Jewish community throughout our history.

Mr. Speaker, one can be a supporter of the state of Israel and at the same time insist that new West Bank settlements be stopped, just as one can be a patriotic American and still oppose military aid to the Contras.

Mr. Speaker, it is simply that American taxpayers do not want to see us, by virtue of our financial assistance to Israel, become associated with a policy of throwing gasoline on Palestinian passions, by appearing to countenance or facilitate further West Bank settlements or by appearing to do less than is necessary to create the conditions for flexible negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, my commitment to Israel's security and to our obligation to continue to assist providing that security is inviolate, but so too is my commitment to see that American taxpayers, Jewish and non-Jewish alike, are not embarrassed by policy actions which are perfectly understandable, given the harassment endured by Israel for a generation, but which nonetheless contain the seeds of tragedy.

dy for Israeli, Arab, and American alike. It is time for friends to sit down with friends and figure out how to change the status quo which threatens to bear such bitter fruit.

□ 1315

MY ADVICE TO THE PRIVILEGED ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENNETT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, just last week the House of Representatives by a margin of eight votes refused the President's request for moneys to continue to supply the so-called Contras or rebels hiding out in Honduras for occasional forays into Nicaragua during which they murdered, pillaged, raped and killed wantonly civilians, both Nicaraguans, farmworkers, teachers, hospital aides, Americans who are there on humanitarian missions, some representing church missionary groups, some representing merely their own desire to help the impoverished peasant classes in Nicaragua. None of them, even the American by the name of Lyndon who was murdered in a most cruel way by the so-called Contras, were engaged in any aspects of the war raging there because of the help that our President and the Congresses have been all too willing to offer. I stated in the last presentation on this House floor that it was very significant and ominous at the same time that the so-called Arias plan had been developed unilaterally by the heads of the Central American states including Honduras which we occupy. We are in out-and-out occupation of the nation known as Honduras. We have military troops and have had them in force since 1982. We have built airport facilities for military purposes. We have built roads for military purposes, not for commercial access to aid a country in its production of farm crops and the like to get to market, but in order to prepare and plan for an eventual invasion of the neighboring nation, Nicaragua.

We have through our State Department and our President, the executive branch, done everything a government could do to forestall, impede, and obstruct the so-called peace plan given the name of the present Costa Rican President, Arias. It should be noted that in this effort it was started up by a pool of crude so-called anti-Communist spirits which have so victimized our thinking since the Russian Revolution.

I have placed in this RECORD several years past the white paper issued by President Coolidge, Secretary of State Frank Kellogg, in which he gives as a reason and rationalizes the sending of the marines in 1929 into Nicaragua in

hot pursuit of Sandino himself, though they never caught him, and then occupying that country for 13 years, making sure that we installed the militia known as the Guardia Civil, that we installed the Somoza dictatorship and despotism of that family, and eventually it was due like a rotten tomato to just cave in as it did in 1979. Everybody outside of the United States who had any voice, any objective evaluation of the situation had no trouble in predicting the eventuality of that occurrence, yet we did everything we could to thwart the revolution in Nicaragua. We did everything we could to maintain that rotten apple, and it was of its own corruption, its own tyrannical devices that it just crumbled. It was the uprising of the Nicaraguan people after 50 years of subjugation with American interests, American money, American arms, and American imposition. There is no way we can escape that dictum of history.

It is true that at one point during the Franklin Roosevelt administration and as a beneficiary of the so-called good-neighbor policy, Nicaragua still remained as a sort of spoiled brat. It was President Somoza that Franklin Roosevelt had referred to when he said, "Yes, I know he is an SOB, but he is our SOB."

And it has been this terribly fallacious thinking that has guided fundamentally our policy. We do not care how bad a regime is as long as it is anti-Communist and proclaims friendship for the United States, but, if we stand on the terms of that friendship, we see that it is not exactly a self-denying, pristine pure friendship for the United States. It has always been those interests that have benefited directly, American interests, if you please, that have been the representatives of what is symbolizing America in that part of the world.

With the vote last week came the usual lamentations, and protestations and rebellious remarks on the part of the administration and the President. In the San Antonio Light for Sunday, yesterday, February 7, there is an article entitled "U.S. may admit rebels." It is bylined by Stewart M. Powell, Washington bureau, and I am sure that means for the Hearst newspapers, because the San Antonio Light is a Hearst newspaper.

Now that Congress has ended seven years of official and unofficial military aid to the U.S.-backed rebels in Nicaragua, the Reagan administration may try to admit to the United States tens of thousands of Contras and their families, U.S. officials said.

Mr. Speaker, that is just the first paragraph, and I include the entire article for the RECORD:

U.S. MAY ADMIT REBELS

(By Stewart M. Powell)

WASHINGTON.—Now that Congress has ended seven years of official and unofficial military aid to the U.S.-backed rebels in

Nicaragua, the Reagan administration may try to admit to the United States tens of thousands of Contras and their families, U.S. officials said.

The action—reminiscent of the U.S. program for admitting at least 130,000 frightened South Vietnamese in the months immediately after the tumultuous American withdrawal from South Vietnam in 1975—may take months to materialize and years to implement, the officials conceded.

Serious obstacles lie in the way.

"People don't want to think about the eventualities," said a White House official involved in the U.S. effort to assist the Contras. "It's a real ticklish problem. It is very difficult for us. What do we do with the people in the field who got the short end of the stick?"

"We'll take care of them—eventually," said a State Department official familiar with U.S. refugee policy. "We'll have to."

Administration officials late last week were vowing to cobble together another last-ditch package of official U.S. assistance for the 16,000 Contra foot soldiers operating within Nicaragua.

President Reagan, who has made Contra aid a hallmark of his administration, promised to "consult" Congress and Central American allies to somehow add to the \$209 million in U.S. assistance provided to the Contras during the past seven years.

The pledge followed the 219-211 House vote to reject Reagan's request for \$36.2 million in fresh supplies, including \$3.6 million in combat supplies.

Said Reagan: "I wish to assure those struggling inside Nicaragua for those values we hold so dear, of my personal support."

Democratic congressional leaders vowed to provide, within three weeks, "humanitarian" aid for the Contras battling Managua's Soviet-backed forces. The Central Intelligence Agency has until Feb. 29 to continue airdrops of food and arms approved by Congress late last year.

Leaders of the U.S.-backed Nicaraguan resistance said their men would fight with or without U.S. aid. Enough ammunition remains for 60 days and enough food for 30, according to Contra leader Adolfo Calero, who said, "We will press on with our last breath."

The State Department publicly declined to talk about "eventualities." Said a spokesman: "We're still talking to the Contras in the present tense about continuing the fight. We intend to support them."

While the administration ruled out soliciting private aid or contributions from U.S. allies as it did secretly during the Iran-Contra affair, retired Gen. John Singlaub, who has been deeply involved in supporting anti-communist efforts around the world, promised to seek private donations by selling "war bonds."

The decisive House vote, following Reagan's personal appeals, effectively ends any hope that the Contras will receive the reliable military assistance required to sustain offensive operations inside Nicaragua, military analysts said.

The President in his Saturday's radio address in a substory underneath this top story, same page, same paper, is quoted as saying in the headline of this small article, "Reagan Says Contras Won't Be Abandoned."

Now what has been the fruit of this misbegotten and illegal policy? So we can go back into history and point out

where just in the 20th century alone our country has invaded Nicaragua about nine times and in 100 years close to a hundred times. But if we do so and refer to these rather dreary details of history, it is only so that we in the Congress can eventually properly have the real perception of that world, not the misperceptions under which we have been belaboring and which I have seen and heard ad nauseam during the so-called debates on the Contra aid or the surrounding corollary issues.

The fact is that until we do we will prescribe for our children, grandchildren and great-grandchildren a balkanization of the Americas. We will have Europeanized America with all of Europe's bitter and ancient hatreds still boiling and churning under the surface even after the most horrendous world wars in which millions and millions of human beings have died.

Mr. Speaker, is this going to be our fate in the New World? It is in our hands to determine it, for after all there is no question that nobody dares challenge the United States as the most powerful country in the world, second to none regardless of all of the fear and the hyped-up pending suspense toward Soviet Russia. The United States, no question about it, certainly in this half of the world is the most powerful military nation, the wealthiest nation in the world, but, as giant as we are, as goliath as indeed we are, I maintain that more than physical force we must have the moral force of what America stands for, and, as we stray from the basic constitutional principles in such direct proportion as we stray, we are in deep trouble with consequences even coming back in our own domestic front.

Why do I say this? So-called Contra leaders, which the President has referred to in the most abominable abuse of words as freedom fighters, have been paid to come to our country, have involved themselves in our internal politics in two Presidential campaigns and in a host of congressional campaigns. Adolfo Calero and his copartner leader of the so-called Contra Cabinet are very safely hiding out in Miami. They are not down there in the jungle fighting for freedom. They are over in Miami with a big boodle in Swiss secret accounts and cheek by jowl with the most nefarious drug peddlers of cocaine and other hard drugs that have ever beset the United States. The reason: because of the insistence, this obsession on the part of our leaders, President and congressional, as well as business, as well as press. The corporate press, rather than being an independent voice, has succumbed to the President's and the administration's pressures.

□ 1230

The administration's influence has been tremendous, everybody admits to that. But since when are we going to abjectly accept the interference in our internal processes, if you please, even though it has happened in even greater amounts? We have had vast Arab oil money interests involved heavily in Presidential campaigns in the past. We have had the so-called anti-Communists, with German units actually left-over hard Nazi elements involving themselves in our politics through money contributions as far back as 1966; in Texas particularly when one so-called group which is really by all descriptions a neo-Nazi group sent \$45,000 in behalf of the U.S. Senator John Tower's effort for reelection in 1966. All of this was reported. But the insinuations of the significance of what is behind the contribution was not any more than the interference in the congressional campaign in El Paso, the campaigns in San Antonio and in the valley of Texas, also some of the campaigns in California, some of the campaigns in the northeast where you have Puerto Rican elements and Cuban elements which were very heavily funded.

What is the source of that money? Taxpayer dollars, if you please, handled by Colero and his buddy, the other leader that shares power with him in Miami. Part of that was also the nefarious illegal activities that the President okayed and resulted in the so-called Iran-Contra scandal which a sort of hodgepodge committee of the Congress was supposed to have looked into but never followed through on these leads, such as the drug trafficking of these Contra elements working cheek by jowl; or the CIA heavily involved through its agents and contract agents using equipment that was even based, flown out and serviced by our regular Defense Department installations, Army as well as Air Force. The shipment of Mariel material, so-called, for the aid of the Contras returned in the form of illegal drugs; the use of such elements as the leading Venezuelan and Colombian drug king Ochoa, all of these things happened because whenever any one of us decides to cut corners, violate the Constitution rather than faithfully execute the laws, determinedly thwart the laws, we are going to get into trouble. It is like in our domestic fight against crime. How in the world can we ever conquer this tremendous "King Crime" if it is cheek by jowl with high government officials, local government officials, State officials and those of other governments that share the New World with us? It is impossible.

We will not do it. It has so permeated the lifestream of our society that I doubt we can survive an effort to successfully extricate this poisonous, this

malignant tumor from our body politic.

The great hero, as described by President Reagan, Ollie North, what is his background? He started out in Southeast Asia as a captain-aid to colonel, later general, Secord.

Many of my colleagues probably remember that name. Where have they made their millions? What was General Secord, assisted by Captain North, aiding and abetting? The biggest kingpin drug lord of Southeast Asia, all in the name of his fighting Thailand Communists, Cambodian Communists and generally South Vietnam Communists; the so-called neutralization of the village officials, the murder of almost 100,000 of mayors and villagers in Southeast Asia. All of that was done in our name by the likes of Captain North, General Secord and a host of others too numerous to mention here.

When we were kicked out ignominiously—you know, our colleagues like to hear a lot of this poison talk. I remember during the political campaigns for presidency we would hear the Republican Party saying, "Well, the Democrats are the ones that start wars." Well, maybe so. But the Democrats win the wars they start; the Republicans lose them as they did in 1975 when we were ignominiously kicked out of Southeast Asia.

What happened to General Secord and Capt. Ollie North? They transferred their activities. Where to? The Middle East, Iran, where there, not in the name of officialdom of America but in the name of private contractors, they continued the same kind of tactics. Should we have been surprised that all of this, done in absolute obstinate resistance to the clearly enunciated policy of the Congress in the Boland amendment of 1984 been a surprise to us? Come on.

How can we claim innocence when our hands are dripping with mud and dirt and blood?

The Arias plan was developed for one simple reason, and this is very poignantly brought out by Father Cesar Jerez of the Society of Jesus, as brought out in an article he wrote in the "Catholic Worker" for December 1987. I will just read from the introductory paragraph, an explanatory, parenthetical remark.

Father Cesar Jerez, S.J., was Jesuit Provincial for Central America from 1978-1983. He is now president of the University of Central America in Managua, Nicaragua. On October 17, 1987, he spoke at Nativity Church and afterwards came to Maryhouse to be interviewed. The following are portions of his remarks.

The article referred to is as follows:

THE ARIAS PEACE PLAN

(By Fr. Cesar Jerez, S.J.)

As you know, on the seventh of August this year, in Guatemala, the Central Ameri-

can presidents signed a peace plan for Central America. This plan has been called Esquipulas II or the Agreement of Guatemala or the Arias Plan. The question could be why, after years of trying to be together on this issue, the presidents finally sign a plan? I can see four main reasons why:

The first one is that, really, by now, the Central Americans are tired of war. So many people have been killed, so many displaced—around 200,000 people have been killed in Central America in the last ten years, and more than two million have been displaced either as refugees in foreign countries or inside their own countries. In my opinion, from a theological point of view, the blood of the poor has spread over the soil of Central America, finally bringing together the Central Americans for the aspiration of peace—a sign of resurrection, uniting Central Americans.

The second point is that there was a strong, Central American feeling at that moment. Why? Because the Central Americans had been preparing and talking about peace for several months, and, at the last moment, the Reagan-Wright plan came along saying: "Here is what you have to discuss." It is very much like this: Imagine that some of you had been preparing a big meal for several days, and at the last minute someone came and said to you, "Here's the menu, you have to eat Chinese food." (I don't have anything against Chinese food!) Something like this happened to the Central Americans. So they looked around and said, "Why should Washington impose on us what we have to eat?" And I would like to say that, for the second time in our history, our presidents came together and said "No." The last time was in the past century, when we fought that national war against [William] Walker.

The third reason that the plan could be approved was that Nicaragua came to the discussion, to the table, with great freedom. Those who are manipulating the news will tell you that Nicaragua can do nothing without first asking permission from Havana and Moscow. But Nicaragua came freely to the negotiations and was ready to give up a lot of things, though making some demands, as well.

And the fourth reason for a successful agreement was precisely the capacity the Central American presidents had to negotiate; for instance, they agreed to the simultaneous application of the peace plan all over Central America.

Now, what is the main content of the plan? The plan is quite complicated, but fundamentally, to accomplish peace the plan is talking about amnesty and dialogue. It is talking about the mobilization [of the good will] of our countries; it is dealing with the idea that nobody can outfit those armed forces which are trying to overthrow any elected government in Central America; and it is also dealing with the point that no country will be used to attack a neighboring country. Those are the main points of the plan.

Last week, [Jeane] Kirkpatrick visited Managua. Last Monday, it was announced that the president of Costa Rica was awarded the Nobel Prize for Peace. Here you have the images of what is going on in Central America. On one side you have that lady coming to Central America, visiting Managua, and telling those who are in the opposition that she is very much in favor of them and against the Nicaraguan revolution. And on the other side you have an institution respected all over the world, the Nobel Prize,

given to Arias, to support the effort of Arias, yes, but mainly to support the process of peace in Central America.

BEING REALISTIC

The plan means a big hope for Central America, no doubt. But, at the same time we have to be realistic, and see that at any time that road to hope can be destroyed, or obstacles could be put in the way. Why? The U.S. administration has the determination to stop the plan, although they have been saying that they are in favor of the plan. Look at what is happening now. Nicaragua took the offensive on the plan. Nicaragua was the first country in Central America to have the National Commission of Reconciliation. They took concrete steps toward democratization—reopening La Prensa, reopening Catholic Radio, and establishing a [unilateral] ceasefire in some parts of the country. But nonetheless, yesterday and today Arias and the [U.S.] administration here have been saying that Nicaragua or Ortega has seduced the contras [into cooperating]. You can imagine what kind of a test it has been for Nicaragua—Nicaragua has been showing a lot of good will. So we have to admit that there are several problems in and with the peace plan.

One of these is that the plan is not dealing with the armed forces in conflict in Central America. Take for instance the case of El Salvador. The Central Americans said that each country has its own characteristics, and they have to solve their problems taking into account those characteristics. In many places, people are using what we call the "symmetric argument," saying that, if Duarte is dealing with the [opposition] fronts, the president of Nicaragua should have to deal with the contras. The question is: Is the case of the fronts talking to Duarte really the same as the case of the contras talking to Ortega? Some of you are surely convinced that it is the same, but I would say it is different. The fronts are strong enough inside El Salvador, they are a force there, they have some territory in possession, and Duarte accepted to have a dialogue with them. In Nicaragua, in the countryside, the contras are strong and are doing quite a lot of destruction. But they cannot say they are in possession of a part of the country; and their strength is generated from outside. If their outside funding could not come to them, you can be sure the contras would disappear—they are sustained from outside.

Let me note, finally, that the plan sets down concrete dates and mechanisms of control for its implementation. When I say that, I am referring to the seventh of November, but that is not the only date. That is the first date for checking the progress of the plan; but on the seventh of December, as well, the international commission of vigilance will also come together to examine how much of the plan has been accomplished. And on the seventh of January, the presidents of Central America have to come together to find out how well the plan has been implemented. The strange thing is that, here in this country, the papers, the news, have been talking only about the seventh of November. But please, those of you who are in favor of peace in Central America, remember the seventh of December and the seventh of January.

Question: Do you think the question of dialogue with the contra leaders is an insurmountable problem?

Answer: It has consistently been the official position of Nicaragua that talks need to be directly with the U.S. administration.

But so far it hasn't been possible to establish those direct talks. In my opinion, it is very much like the poor knocking at the door of the rich, asking for dialogue, and the answer has been: "You are liars, you are not telling the truth, we are not ready to talk to you." Nonetheless, President Ortega has kept insisting at the United Nations that this be done. And some of the Central American presidents, even Arias of Costa Rica and Cerezo of Guatemala, have insisted that the U.S. should talk to Nicaragua. I think, and my conviction is, that Nicaragua will do any possible thing to overcome this problem—how and when, we will see.

Q: But what does Nicaragua realistically expect to get out of this peace plan? What sort of guarantees are there that anything will come of it?

A: For us, peace, concretely, means to stop the war. Of course, you could say that even if you stop the war, the question would remain—do you have some criteria to say what peace is about? I would simply say that what can be accomplished in favor of the majority of any country, in favor of the poor in any country, that is what concretely means peace for us. To stop the war and do things in favor of the poor of the country—that is peace, and that is what we're trying to accomplish. The plan says, right at the beginning, that what we need in Central America is social justice—that's quite clear. As for having a guarantee, we cannot have a clear map or blueprint of the situation precisely because it is a struggle and you have several forces in conflict. You also have the biggest power in the world, the U.S. administration, trying to stop that small revolution called the Nicaraguan revolution. That is precisely what the struggle is about. Some are in favor and some against, and to those who are in favor I would say that it is quite clear what we would like to accomplish.

Q: Why do you not return to Guatemala, your native land?

A: I cannot go back to Guatemala because in 1980 I made a strong statement on the killing of the Indian population of Guatemala. The reaction of the Guatemalan government was to publish a list of several names, of, they said, the leaders and intellectuals of the country who should be eliminated. The first was Manuel Colon Argueta, who had already been killed. The second had also already been killed. The third was my name.

I am not an intellectual; I am not a leader. Why was my name there? They said I was destroying the image of the country. A question of aesthetics—accusing me of damaging the image of the country. But rather it is a question of ethics, because they are destroying the country. Since then they have attacked me quite openly. I feel like a Central American; I would say I am happy doing what I am doing now.

Q: As a Guatemalan, how do you feel about the accords being signed in your own country, where the military will not be brought to any accountability for the crimes committed against the Guatemalan people?

A: I think that Cerezo has been playing a rather important role in the international field, and he has gotten a good name at that international level. I think that his plan has been to say, "Okay, if I can get international support then I can do something inside Guatemala. But the fact is that he has accomplished very little inside Guatemala, because the military are following any movement he is making. Until now, Cerezo has had the capacity to bargain or to escape from the army. But if he wanted to take a

strong position and do something clear for social justice, my feeling is that he cannot go too far. But, it's also true that, for the first time in many years, the Catholic bishops in Guatemala are pretty well united. Mainly on the human rights issues and on the rights of the Indian population—they have been quite strong on certain issues, which is really good—but also [in light of] the experience of what happened to the guerilla movements in Guatemala. I can see that many or some of the bishops are very much afraid, and they are kept in a sort of "no way out." Because they say, "Okay, Cerezo is not the solution, the military are not the solution. But neither are the guerilla movements, because the killing has been awful already and will be awful in the future. So what is the way out?"

Q: Other danger points in the plan concern the roles of Honduras and El Salvador, both of which countries are almost hostage to U.S. aid. And what of efforts to coerce Costa Rica? U.S. A.I.D., for instance, recently denied a loan to Costa Rica.

A: I agree with you that two of the weak points in the plan are El Salvador and Honduras. The case of Costa Rica is a special case. When you see Mr. Duarte kissing the U.S. flag and you see the amount of money flowing into El Salvador to that civil war—for Central Americans to see that, it is awful. Probably even for you—it's a mixture of something naive, dumb, nonsense, whatever you call it. How could he do it? So we know that at any time the present U.S. administration can force Mr. Duarte or Mr. Azcona to withdraw from the peace plan. That is true, and that will be their responsibility vis-a-vis Central American history. Honduras is an occupied country, a country which has been used and abused by the U.S. [armed] forces—and, at any time, they can do anything with Honduras. Take for instance if Honduras [backed by the U.S.] were to provoke Nicaragua, creating an incident at the border; after that they could say, "Okay, we withdraw from the plan." That's a possibility, in other words. That is why Nicaragua has to take a lot of care and not be provoked.

With Costa Rica the problem is the external debt of that country; as well, I think that Mr. Arias has never been sympathetic to the Nicaraguan revolution. If you will remember, when he took over, he did not invite Ortega to his inauguration—he made it known that Ortega was unwelcome. And, at the inauguration, Mr. Arias asked for the signatures of the other presidents attending, to say that the Nicaraguans should have elections immediately. Nobody accepted that document and they left Costa Rica without signing it. So, in that sense, Costa Rica can be used. But nonetheless there is hope—there is good will, and we would like to do anything possible to accomplish peace.

Suffice for me to say that Father Arias—and nobody can accuse him of being a Marxist-Leninist Communist or a menace to the United States—says when asked "But why is it, why is it that this peace plan finally evolved" he said, "I will tell you why: because the leaders of these seven Central American entities and neighbors are tired of the bloodshed."

More than 200,000 people have died and their people are saying, "Look, we want you to put a stop to this. We don't care what it costs."

And this is why President Arias could finally get a hitherto fractious, divided, pluralistic group of presidents and put them together in open defiance to the United States.

The United States was doing everything it could to say, "Don't you dare meet and do this."

When President Arias was being elected about 2 years ago or so our Ambassador in San Jose was doing everything he could to bring about his defeat. And he did not succeed because Costa Rica has been a democracy for 100 years. It is the one true democracy with literate people surrounded by people sunk in ignorance and poverty.

Costa Rica, for some other factors too numerous to go into now, has mandatory and has had mandatory education for 100 years.

Costa Rica has open elections. Anybody can run.

The last election that Mr. Arias was running in they had two men running under the Communist Party. Where do you think they came from? They came from the labor union of the United Fruit Plantation.

So that when we talk about these countries in such a demeaning condescending way it merely means that we are ignorant of their nature, we are ignorant of their history, we are ignorant of their magnificent culture and we are headed for disaster for we have a willful President who says notwithstanding what the Congress wants, just like Secretary Weinberger said shortly before he resigned, he said, "Oh, we are not going to obey that law," referring to the so-called War Powers Limitation Act, "because we don't consider it constitutional." Why, that is the way kings talk, not Presidents in a democracy and a constitutional democracy at that.

A LEGACY OF HOPE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BENNETT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BRYANT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, in the waning days of 1987 an idealist died and today, February 8, 1988, as our Nation again begins its Presidential selection process in earnest with the Iowa caucuses, the recognition of the lifetime contributions of this extraordinary individual is fitting.

Of all the people I have encountered in the world of politics none has been as consistently and persistently optimistic about the ability of right-thinking people to better the world in which we live—globally and locally—as John B. Rogers, Jr.

John Rogers, who succumbed to an asthma attack at the age of 52 after beating cancer, was many things. A loving husband and father. A respected editor and reporter for newspapers

in Lubbock, San Antonio, and Austin, TX. A union leader and communications director for the Texas AFL-CIO. A campaign manager and political consultant. And a newsletter publisher and businessman.

One could probably have foreseen the potential contributions of John Rogers, who, as a young man of 10 in San Antonio, published his own neighborhood newspaper. The youthful crusader went on to the University of Texas, dropping out to earn a living before finally returning and graduating with a degree in journalism in 1960.

Texas AFL-CIO President Harry Hubbard eulogized John Rogers by remembering that:

John coined a phrase, "Always plan your work, and work your plan." Yes, we'll miss you as we plan for the future and we'll miss you as we work our plan. However, your guidance will remain with us always. . . . Wherever workers and other progressive groups assemble in the name of workers' rights or social justice, John will be there admonishing us to do more.

John Rogers devoted his life to "fighting the forces of evil," as he so often observed. He rallied legions of followers in the fight. To him and to those of us who often joined him in that righteous combat, the effort was invigorating. John Rogers taught us that fighting for just causes inspires us to do even more, not to tire of the battle.

Austin political columnist Dave McNeely wrote that—

Rogers was a no-nonsense political strategist. His whole life was directed at his family, his friends and promoting efforts to improve the lot of humanity.

It says a lot about the kind of man John Rogers was that, at his memorial service, the church was packed with hundreds of the men and women who fought at his side and quite a few who had stood on the other side, that the tributes to his memory included laughter and thanksgiving for his contributions, as well as sadness at his passing.

Those of us privileged to know and work with him share with wife Mary Beth and his children, Billy and Eleanor, the joy that John Rogers brought to almost everything he turned his attention to.

If there didn't seem to be a way to make things right, he'd create a new one. If few others seemed to share his passion for the cause at hand, he'd find the most clever ways to enlist sufficient troops to get the job done.

John Rogers was the most practical of idealists. And, largely because of John Rogers, as I look to the future, I know that our dreams of a better world can and will be realized.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the

legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. OBEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ANNUNZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OBEY, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. ALEXANDER, for 30 minutes, on February 9.

Mr. DINGELL, for 60 minutes, on February 17.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. GONZALEZ) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BRYANT, for 15 minutes, today.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 60 minutes, on February 9.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DANNEMEYER) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. HEFLEY.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire.

Mr. GILMAN.

Mr. GINGRICH in two instances.

The following Members (at the request of Mr. OBEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. BRYANT.

Mr. ANDERSON in 10 instances.

Mr. GONZALEZ in 10 instances.

Mr. BROWN of California in 10 instances.

Mr. ANNUNZIO in six instances.

Mr. JONES of Tennessee in 10 instances.

Mr. KANJORSKI.

Mr. NATCHER.

Mr. MAZZOLI.

Mr. HUTTO.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, February 9, 1988, at 12 noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2855. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a report and determination that Israel is not being denied its right to participate in the activities of the International Atomic Energy Agency; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2856. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the fiscal year 1986 annual report of the Reserve Forces Policy Board, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 113(c), (e); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2857. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 7-138, "Protection for Foreign Officials, Official Guests, and Internationally Protected Persons Amendment Act of 1987," and report, pursuant to D.C. section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2858. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 7-140, "Senior Citizens' Home Repair and Improvement Program Fund Act of 1987," and report, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

2859. A letter from the Staff Director, Commission on Education of the Deaf, transmitting a report on the quality of education of deaf persons in America, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 4342(b); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2860. A letter from the Chairman, Intergovernmental Advisory Council on Education, transmitting a report and accompanying recommendations for the improvement of the educational system in the area of job training and retraining; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2861. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of actions taken to increase competition for contracts during fiscal year 1987, pursuant to 41 U.S.C. 419; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2862. A letter from the Director, National Science Foundation, transmitting a report of actions taken to increase competition for contracts during fiscal year 1987, pursuant to 41 U.S.C. 419; to the Committee on Government Operations.

2863. A letter from the Director, National Science Foundation, transmitting a report on women and minorities in science and engineering, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1885d; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

2864. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, transmitting the annual report on ocean pollution, monitoring, and research covering fiscal year 1986; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

2865. A letter from the Executive Secretary, Office of the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the report on Department of Defense procurement from small and other business firms for October through November 1987, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 639(d); to the Committee on Small Business.

2866. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the annual report on Medicare for fiscal year 1984, and the End Stage Renal Disease Program, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1395ll(b); 42 U.S.C. 1395rr; jointly, to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina (for himself, Mr. DAVIS of Michigan, Mr. HUTTO, Mr. BIAGGI, and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 3918. A bill to authorize expenditures for boating safety programs, and for other purposes; jointly, to the Committees on Ways and Means and Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ANNUNZIO:

H.R. 3919. A bill to provide for the striking of medals in commemoration of the bicentennial of the U.S. Coast Guard; to the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs.

By Mr. ARMEY (for himself and Mr. CRANE):

H.R. 3920. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to repeal its minimum wage and overtime requirements; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CONTE (for himself, Mr. McDADE, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DREIER of California, Mr. GALLO, and Mr. UPTON):

H.R. 3921. A bill to amend section 15(l) of the Small Business Act; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. COUGHLIN:

H.R. 3922. A bill to amend section 1807(a)(7) of Public Law 99-514; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H.R. 3923. A bill to make a technical correction to section 8103 of title 46, United States Code; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H.R. 3924. A bill to clarify that certain technical assistance grants shall be treated for Federal tax purposes as being made for a charitable purpose; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANTOS (for himself and Mr. LOTT):

H.J. Res. 451. Joint resolution commending the State of Israel and its people on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the establishment of the independent State of Israel; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McEWEN (for himself and Mr. PEPPER):

H.J. Res. 452. Joint resolution designating December 12, 1988, as "National Freedom Fighters Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SOLARZ (for himself and Mr. LAGOMARSINO):

H.J. Res. 453. Joint resolution designating September 16, 1988, as "National POW/MIA Recognition Day"; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HOWARD (for himself and Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT):

H. Res. 365. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Public Works and Transportation in the 2d sess. of the 100th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina (for himself and Mr. DAVIS of Michigan):

H. Res. 366. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries in the 2d sess. of the 100th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY (for himself and Mr. SOLOMON):

H. Res. 367. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Veterans' Affairs in the 2d sess. of the 100th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. RANGEL (for himself and Mr. GILMAN):

H. Res. 368. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for

expenses of investigations and studies by the Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control in the 2d sess. of the 100th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ROE (for himself and Mr. LUJAN):

H. Res. 369. Resolution honoring the 25th anniversary of the Cerro Tololo Inter-American Observatory; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. ROYBAL:

H. Res. 370. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Select Committee on Aging in the 2d sess. of the 100th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. ST GERMAIN:

H. Res. 371. Resolution providing amounts from the contingent fund of the House for expenses of investigations and studies by the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs in the 2d sess. of the 100th Congress; to the Committee on House Administration.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MOORHEAD:

H.R. 3925. A bill for the relief of Gagik Barseghian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. SMITH of Nebraska:

H.R. 3926. A bill for the relief of Nebraska Aluminum Castings, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 42: Mr. BUECHNER.

H.R. 732: Mr. MYERS of Indiana, Mr. NIELSON of Utah, Mr. BARNARD, Mr. BLAZ, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. DERRICK, Mr. FAUNTROY, Mr. HYDE, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. WISE, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. McDADE, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. BATES, Ms. OAKAR, Mr. McMILLAN of North Carolina, Mr. BADHAM, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. DOWDY of Mississippi, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. PENNY, Mr. FOGLIETTA, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. MADIGAN, Mr. ROE, Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RITTER, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. DAVIS of Michigan, Mr. RINALDO, Mrs. MEYERS of Kansas, Mr. COELHO, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. NEAL, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. RIDGE, Mrs. PATTERSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. McCLOSKEY, Mr. IRELAND, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. HILER, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. APLEGATE, Mr. HENRY, Mr. JONES of Tennessee, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. GRANDY, Mr. PARRIS, Mr. McGRATH, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. NOWAK, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. SKAGGS, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. CHAPMAN, Mr. CLINGER, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. PEASE, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. BOULTER, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. FISH, Mr. PERKINS, Mr. LUNGREN, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr.

KANJORSKI, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. CRANE, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. BUNNING, Mr. REGULA, Mr. KASICH, Mr. DeLAY, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. WOLPE, Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. ROBINSON, Mr. LEWIS of Florida, Mr. STALLINGS, and Mr. STAGGERS.

H.R. 1184: Mr. FRENZEL.

H.R. 1197: Mr. DAVIS of Michigan.

H.R. 1352: Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 1394: Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. CLARKE, Mr.

HOWARD, Mr. SUNIA, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. WEISS, Mr. GORDON, Mr. DAUB, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. STUDDS, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. WOLPE, and Mr. GRAY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1583: Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. DREIER of California.

H.R. 1925: Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 1966: Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 2051: Mr. DAVIS of Michigan.

H.R. 2134: Mr. ROE, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. LAGOMARSINO, Mr. HENRY, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. BOUCHER, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. FORD of Michigan, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ECKART, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. MFUME, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. MORRISON of Connecticut, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. CLARKE, and Mr. McEWEN.

H.R. 2239: Mr. WEISS.

H.R. 2532: Mr. BIAGGI.

H.R. 2879: Mr. GARCIA and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 2950: Mr. TALLON.

H.R. 3019: Mr. TALLON.

H.R. 3144: Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT, Mrs. BOGGS, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. STENHOLM, and Mr. GIBBONS.

H.R. 3340: Mr. WEISS.

H.R. 3397: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. COLLINS, Mrs. BENTLEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MFUME, Mr. ROE, Mr. CONTE, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. BIAGGI, and Mr. JONTZ.

H.R. 3440: Mr. BEILENSEN and Mr. FAWELL.

H.R. 3455: Mr. BATES, Mr. JACOBS, and Mr. HUGHES.

H.R. 3511: Mr. COLEMAN of Texas.

H.R. 3562: Mr. SIKORSKI, Mr. BOSCO, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. SLATTERY, Mr. WYDEN, Mr. KOSTMAYER, Mr. WISE, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.R. 3610: Mr. BEVILL, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. JONTZ, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LATTI, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.R. 3783: Ms. KAPTUR and Mr. OWENS of Utah.

H.R. 3791: Mr. HORTON, Mr. PEPPER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. FRANK, Mr. GUNDERSON, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. DAUB, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. SHUMWAY, Mr. WILSON, Mr. MICA, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. ROE, Mr. HASTERT, and Mr. PARRIS.

H.R. 3794: Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 3814: Mr. WISE, Mr. COLEMAN of Missouri, Mr. PORTER, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mrs. BYRON, Mr. OXLEY, and Mr. DAN-NEMEYER.

H.R. 3815: Mr. SOLOMON.

H.R. 3820: Mr. AKAKA.

H.R. 3847: Mr. FAWELL, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. WHITTAKER.

H.R. 3881: Mr. SCHUETTE, Mr. DAUB, Mr. MARLENEE, Mr. NICHOLS, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. WALKER, Mr. PETRI, Mr. QUILLEN, Mr. GUNDERSON, and Mr. TRAXLER.

H.R. 3893: Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. PENNY, Mr. KYL, and Mr. BROOMFIELD.

H.R. 3907: Mr. MACK, Mr. SUNDQUIST, Mr. TALLON, Mr. CHAPMAN, and Mr. SLATTERY.

H.J. Res. 374: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. DAVIS of Michigan, Mr. UPTON, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. KOLTER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. LELAND, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. HAMILTON, and Mr. LOWRY of Washington.

H.J. Res. 405: Mr. CLARKE, Mr. FISH, Mr. EDWARDS of Oklahoma, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. WYDEN.

H.J. Res. 429: Mr. GILMAN, Mr. WEBER, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FROST, and Mr. ARMEY.

H.J. Res. 438: Mr. FORD of Tennessee, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. BRUCE, Mr. ESPY, Mr. KOLTER, Mr. ROE, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. ROWLAND of Connecticut, Mrs. LLOYD, Mr. LEACH of Iowa, Mr. LEHMAN of California, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MACK, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. PORTER, Mr. MORRISON of Washington, Mr. FROST, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. HATCHER, and Mr. SCHUETTE.

H.J. Res. 447: Mr. PERKINS, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. SOLARZ, Mr. BEVILL, Mr. FLIPPO, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. FUSTER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. HORTON, Mr. CHAPPELL, Mr. WORTLEY, Mr. LUJAN, Mr. McDADE, Mr. GREGG, Mr. HOPKINS, Mr. FAWELL, Mr. VANDER JAGT, Mr. MILLER of Washington, Mr. McEWEN, Mr. MARTIN of New York, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. RAVENEL, Mr. HENRY, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. GILMAN.

H. Con. Res. 216: Mr. CROCKETT.

H. Con. Res. 223: Mr. ARMEY, Mr. AuCOIN, Mr. BADHAM, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BUECHNER, Mr. BUSTAMANTE, Mr. CLARKE, Mr. COLEMAN of Texas, Mr. DANNE-MEYER, Mr. DORNAN of California, Mr. FISH, Mr. GARCIA, Mr. GLICKMAN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. KEMP, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LEVINE of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOWRY of Washington, Mr. MACK, Mr. MANTON, Mr. OWENS of New York, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, Mr. SOLOMON, Mr. STRATTON, Mr. TORRES, Mr. TRAXLER, Mr. WALKER, Mr. WEISS, Mr. WELDON, Mr. YATES, and Mr. YOUNG of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 237: Ms. OAKAR, Mr. STARK, Miss SCHNEIDER, Mr. MOODY, Mr. DELLUMS, Mr. COELHO, Mr. WALGREN, Mr. FROST, Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER, Mr. BATEMAN, Mr. RICHARDSON, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. HORTON, Mr. JONTZ, Mr. WHEAT, Mr. AKAKA, Mr. CARPER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. DYMALLY, Mrs. SAIKI, Mr. TOWNS, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SMITH of Florida, Mr. LOWERY of California, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. DeWINE, Mr. SCHEUER, Ms. PELOSI, Mrs. COLLINS, Mr. INHOFE, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. SWIFT, Mr. MAVROULES, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. SYNAR, Mr. PURSELL, and Mr. DONNELLY.

H. Res. 300: Mr. FRANK, Mr. DeWINE, Mr. JONTZ, Mrs. MARTIN of Illinois, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. HOYER, Mr. MRAZEK, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. HORTON, Mrs. BENTLEY, Mr. DWYER of New Jersey, Mr. FAWELL, and Mrs. BOXER.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MAYOR BARRY MAKES DRUGS
HIS MAIN TARGET IN 1988

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1988

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Times and the Washington Post each published articles on January 27, 1988, saying that D.C. Mayor Marion Barry pledged in his State of the District Address to make combatting drugs his No. 1 priority in 1988. He also urged that a drug summit be held among the Governors of Virginia, Maryland, and himself. I applaud Mayor Barry for making fighting drugs his No. 1 priority and for his regional initiative and ask that the articles be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Times, Jan. 27, 1988]

BARRY MAKES DRUGS HIS MAIN '88 TARGET
(By Michael Hedges)

D.C. Mayor Marion Barry announced yesterday new city programs for 1988—including new anti-drug efforts and a cash incentive for area high school students—but hinted broadly that his promises would be financed with a tax increase.

In his annual State of the District address, delivered at the John F. Kennedy Center, the mayor said he would make "the crusade against drugs my number one priority in 1988."

But, after outlining his anti-drug programs to applause, the mayor slipped in a statement that first drew groans, and then a smattering of cheers from an audience composed largely of city workers: "I may have to call on you for revenue enhancements to support our programs."

After his address, the mayor refused to discuss possible tax increases, saying his program would be revealed when he delivered his budget to the City Council on Feb. 8.

But Ward 2 council member John Wilson, chairman of the council's committee on finance and revenue, said, "I think [Mr. Barry] will ask for a tax increase this year. I don't know where they're going to suggest it come from or which tax will be affected. But I do know that the citizens of this city cannot stand any more tax increases."

Concerning the city's drug abuse problems, Mr. Barry said that, within "a week or so," he would give the details of a new city-wide effort to arrest drug pushers on the streets of the District.

During an impromptu press conference after the address, the mayor refused to describe the program, or say if it would replace or supplement the Clean Sweep program that has been used by city police against drug sellers.

At a recent press conference, the mayor would only say that Clean Sweep was being "evaluated." But city government sources have said Mr. Barry considers the program too costly in police overtime, and too much

of a strain on the city's prison system to continue.

Mr. Barry also yesterday called for a "summit" with Virginia Gov. Gerald Baliles and Maryland Gov. William Donald Schaefer to discuss the regional drug abuse problem. No date for such a meeting was announced.

And, in what he described as a related effort, the mayor announced he would be giving the top 10 percent of city high school students a check for \$1,000 as a reward for their academic efforts.

After his speech, the mayor said of the cash incentive: "They see their friends with a pocket full of money from drug dealing, we have to combat that. We are a materialistic society."

"It saves us more to give them \$1,000 than to spend \$19,000 a year to put somebody in jail," he said. Mr. Barry estimated that the program would cost about \$450,000, but said he would do it "even if it costs a million."

The proposal drew mixed reviews from members of the city's school board.

"It certainly is putting money in a direction that would give children something to aspire to," said Board of Education President Linda Cropp. "I think the idea is fantastic."

Board member Bob Boyd said, "My initial reaction is to be very leery of that. We used to expect young people to do well for their own benefit not, in effect, to bribe them to do something for their own good. I would condition the money being spent on higher education."

The mayor referred only briefly to problems in the city. On corruption in the city government, he said: "There have been a few who misused the public trust, abused my personal trust, and stole from the public treasury. I will not allow that from anyone in this government, just as you should not allow it from anyone you trust," he said.

But the mayor drew the most sustained applause of his address when he laid his woes on the city news corps. "There are some members of the media who would rather peep into our bedrooms than report our accomplishments," he said. "There are some journalists who would rather make the news than report the news."

The mayor's speech, delivered to an audience of about 1,200 city workers, school children and the elderly who were bused in for the occasion, stressed the need for citizen involvement in city affairs.

"A successful city is a partnership," he said. "I promise you today as long as I am mayor this government will continue to try. This government will provide the opportunity. But is you the people who will make a profound difference," he said.

The mayor delivered the speech in a fiery, evangelical style which was often punctuated by cheering. Before he spoke, the Eastern High School chorus gave a stirring rendition of the first chapter of Genesis in song. Then, a huge screen behind the mayor was used to show a slickly produced video on the city's history, which was heavily laden with praise for Mr. Barry.

At the end of the speech, departing guests were given a digital clock imbedded in plas-

tic as a souvenir. As of late yesterday, city officials could not say how much the event cost city taxpayers.

Both the slide show and the mayor's speech focused on the progress the city has made in the two decades since the 1968 riots following the assassination of Martin Luther King Jr.

"The gunfire and the screaming sirens were the sounds of a dying city," the mayor said, recalling the spring of 1968. "But Washington did not die. It lived. It grew. It has become a proud model of accomplishment and prosperity."

Council member Harry Thomas said: "It was one of the best speeches I've heard him give. I hope we can help him live up to some of the promises he made."

Mr. Wilson was less effusive. "He basically told us what a great mayor the mayor is, and most of what he talked about the council did with a lot of resistance from him," he said.

The "big issue" the mayor did not address was the city's prison overcrowding problem, Mr. Wilson said. "If people can go out in the street and earn \$1,000 in two hours, knowing that if they get caught and if they go to jail they'll be out the same day, then that's not a deterrent to the drug problem or the crime situation," he said.

(Vincent McCraw and Carrie Dowling contributed to this report.)

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 28, 1988]

MAYOR BARRY'S "CRUSADE"

There was nothing all that original in his proposal, but Mayor Barry struck the right note in his "State of the District" speech Tuesday. In calling for government as well as citizen action, the mayor declared a "crusade against drugs" to be his "number one priority in 1988." The address was focused on what has become the single most deadly threat to the safety of this city's residents, young and old alike. Drugs, big-crime money and murder have been taking over neighborhoods at a terrifying pace—and though no speech by a mayor can stem the tide, Mr. Barry's pledge of a "citywide attack" and a summit of regional leaders could help.

"Drugs threaten our stability," said the mayor. "Drugs threaten our safety . . . and drugs threaten the soul of our city." There is no exaggeration here: with alarming speed, the city has become a lucrative drug market violently fought over by competing criminal groups from around the country and the world. Law enforcement authorities, including U.S. Attorney Joseph diGenova, have warned that the lives of innocent bystanders are increasingly endangered. Mr. diGenova, citing this "new level of violence and danger to the community," has noted that the groups have "no code of conduct" and "do not care who is killed."

Mr. Barry's message was short on details, but his attack seems to include additional programs tailored to various schools, more job training for young people and increased neighborhood activism against drug use. And though his administration is being criticized for cutting back on the "Operation Cleansweep" program of the police,

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

the mayor says he is about to announce new police initiatives against drug dealers.

Only then—and whenever his other proposals materialize and translate into specific actions—will residents have a real measure of this latest “crusade.” But those Washingtonians who must live in the degradation and gunfire of the urban drug scene are understandably desperate for some shred of evidence that their government and others across the city have a sense of what is happening.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 27, 1988]

BARRY SOUNDS THE CALL FOR AREA DRUG SUMMIT

(By Tom Sherwood)

D.C. Mayor Marion Barry, declaring he will make a “crusade against drugs my number one priority in 1988,” touted a get-tough agenda of antidrug measures yesterday and strongly suggested that he will seek higher taxes to meet the rising cost of major city services.

Pledging a “citywide attack” and calling for increased neighborhood activism, the mayor proposed a drug summit with the governors of Virginia and Maryland and other regional leaders, and laid out plans for new school and job training programs to aid youths “at risk.”

Barry, under fire for cutting back on Operation Clean Sweep, also said he will announce major new police initiatives soon.

The mayor outlined his plans in a generally upbeat 40-minute State of the District address delivered at the Kennedy Center. Invoking memories of the riots 20 years ago, he hailed the city’s progress since then but decried a recent spate of drug-related killings.

“Drugs threaten our stability. Drugs threaten our safety . . . and drugs threaten the soul of our city,” Barry said in a speech that was interrupted frequently by applause from the crowd of more than 2,000. The assemblage included the mayor’s Cabinet members, government workers, business leaders, senior citizens and 500 public school children bused in for the occasion.

Barry’s speech was generally met with enthusiasm, but D.C. Council members reacted with caution to his passing comment that he “may have to call on you for revenue enhancements to support our programs.” Barry, who is to present his fiscal 1989 budget on Feb. 8, declined to be more specific with reporters about a tax increase.

Council member John A. Wilson (D-Ward 2), chairman of the Finance and Revenue Committee who twice led successful fights last year to block Barry’s proposed income tax increases, said, “I don’t think [a tax proposal] would be greeted kindly, but it would be given a fair hearing. . . . At the moment, I’m not willing to accept anything.”

Among the other major proposals in the speech were: A juvenile justice initiative called “Invest in the Future” that would coordinate new and existing programs designed to help young people.

Plans to expand cash awards to high school scholars. Barry proposed giving \$1,000 to public school students who graduate in the top 10 percent of their class, a proposal that could cost more than \$400,000 annually. Barry later told reporters that he may also offer similar cash awards to an unspecified number of students who are designated as “most improved” by schools regardless of their grade averages.

Creation of a “mobile city hall . . . to bring services of the government to every corner of the city.” Barry said he would ac-

company the vehicle at times to see problems firsthand.

Targeting job training and development specifically in neighborhoods east of the Anacostia River in Wards 6, 7 and 8, with a particular emphasis on redeveloping a portion of St. Elizabeths Hospital.

Establishment of a new downtown jobs center and the opening of a business and career center for minority youths interested in establishing businesses.

Acknowledging shortcomings in his staff, Barry said he is shaking up his administration to fill several key jobs that are vacant or held by acting officials.

On allegations of corruption in government, Barry said there will always be some who steal but added, “I will not tolerate that from anyone in this government.”

Some of the most sustained applause came when Barry sharply criticized the news media, saying there “are some journalists who call every problem a setback . . . who would rather peep in our bedrooms than report our accomplishments . . . who would rather make the news than report the news . . . who think of themselves as judge, jury and executioners.”

Many city officials in the crowd cheered wildly and stared up at a balcony filled with reporters and television cameras. Barry later refused to identify the reporters or news organizations to which he referred.

Barry did not specify when he might seek the regional summit with Virginia Gov. Gerald L. Baliles, Maryland Gov. William Donald Schaefer and suburban officials to draft antidrug policies.

The mayor, in seeking more regional cooperation, said the District handles a disproportionate share of the area’s social problems, such as homelessness, and called on the city’s wealthier neighbors to do more. Drugs “know no city boundaries,” Barry said, adding that “Washington will no longer be the region’s drug marketplace.”

Baliles’ press secretary, Chris Bridge, said the governor was unaware of Barry’s regional summit proposal and would need more details. “Obviously it’s in the region’s interest,” said Bridge.

Schaefer spokesman Bob Douglas said, “I don’t believe the governor has been contacted by the mayor. However, a few weeks ago [Schaefer] said the state of Maryland needs to work on a regional basis to solve several problems including drug trafficking. . . .

“The governor will be pleased to know the mayor supports his suggestion.”

An aide to Prince Georges’ executive Parris Glendening said Barry talked about the summit last week with Glendening and that the county executive is “all in favor of it.”

COMMERCIAL KILLING OF WHALES

HON. JOHN MILLER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1988

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Speaker, today I join in cosponsoring two bills being introduced which address a likely violation of the International Whaling Commission’s agreement to commercial killing of whales.

For decades, the world watched as hunters, legal and illegal, decimated the whale population. The United States sought to end this carnage when, in 1972 we petitioned the Interna-

tional Whaling Commission to end commercial whaling. In 1982, the International Whaling Commission adopted an indefinite cessation of the commercial killing of whales beginning in 1986.

Both the United States and the International Whaling Commission have worked long and hard to achieve this objective. But after all this progress, now we learn that five Japanese whaling ships recently set sail for Antarctica to slaughter 300 minke whales under the guise of scientific research.

This is an insult to scientific research. Worse it means more carnage, more slaughter of this supposedly protected species.

My colleague GERRY STUDDS will introduce a bill which urges the Secretary of Commerce to certify under the Magnuson Fisheries Conservation and Management Act, that Japan is undercutting the International Whaling Commission’s protocols.

With this certification, if Japan kills these whales, the Secretary of State must reduce by at least 50 percent any fishery allocation made to Japan and will authorize the President to restrict imports of Japanese fishery products.

This bill is important because it puts the Japanese, or any other country, on notice that commercial whale kills carry a very high price. It tells the world in no uncertain terms, that we will not tolerate the continued slaughter of this species.

My colleague, DON BONKER’s resolution states that it is the policy of the United States to support the indefinite cessation of all commercial whaling. It also calls on all nations to refrain from activities which would undermine the whaling moratorium of the International Convention for the Regulation of Whaling. And, last, it calls for sanctions against those nations which continue to kill whales in violation of this widely supported convention.

Mr. Speaker, I am cosponsoring these two resolutions because they are important. But I am also cosponsoring these resolutions because I have watched the whales off Friday Harbor and Point No Point in Washington State. These magnificent creatures have a right to live. They have a place on this Earth as sacred as our own.

Congressman STUDDS’ resolution will be referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries and its Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife Conservation and the Environment. Congressman BONKER’s resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and its Subcommittee on Human Rights and International Organization. I serve on both these key subcommittees and will be working for early consideration and approval of these resolutions.

This is an important environmental issue. It is also a very important test of our resolve to prevent the destruction of these great creatures. And, it is a test of our resolve to make the moratorium we have been working on for over 15 years effective.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support both resolutions.

CONTINUING THE REVOLUTION

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1988

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, the question has been asked as to whether supply-side economics is finished. Unequivocally, the answer is "No." Recently, economist Paul Craig Roberts revealed the indisputable victory of supply-side economics while the Atlanta Journal editorial board called for a new battlefield to be opened.

[From Business Week, Dec. 28, 1987]

THE INDISPUTABLE VICTORY OF SUPPLY-SIDE ECONOMICS

[By Paul Craig Roberts]

Is supply-side economics finished? Only in the sense that General George S. Patton's army was finished in Germany in May, 1945.

The war for acceptance of supply-side economics was won several years ago, when its main propositions were incorporated into such standard economics texts as Paul A. Samuelson's and a new generation of PhD candidates began researching supply-side topics in their dissertations. Today macroeconomic models attempt to incorporate such supply-side principles as the impact of taxation on incentive as a matter of course, and empirical investigations of the magnitude of supply-side effects are a mainstay of academic research. Economists have given up trying to disprove it. Instead, they spend their time measuring and estimating its effectiveness.

On the political level, after the stock market crash it has become clear that the supply-side war has been won. Not a single one of the 12 Presidential candidates wants to raise tax rates to balance the budget. The few candidates who even mention tax hikes specify that they will only entertain taxes that would not harm incentives on the supply side of the economy. On Dec. 10, the GOP governor and Democratic legislature of Florida were forced by public outcry to backpedal on a 5% tax they had jointly imposed on services.

What better time to repeal the Reagan tax-rate reductions to raise taxes than now? We have a lame-duck President battered by the Iran-contra affair and the worst stock market crash in history, surrounded by aides known best for their willingness to sell out principles in order to put together a political deal. Yet no one is leading the charge except a few obscure left-wing academics who occasionally manage to get the attention of a disgruntled journalist.

Paradoxically, today the supply siders' main concern is the Federal Reserve Board. Only the Fed has the power to produce an economic catastrophe that would make it politically profitable to repudiate Reaganomics. If the Fed leads the economy into a recession, a grateful political left would sing its praises.

TAXES DON'T MATTER?

Prior to the supply-side revolution, the economy's performance was believed to depend on the total level of spending or demand in the economy. Economists thought that taxes affected only the ability of private individuals to spend, and since the government spent the tax revenues, taxation did not lessen the driving force of demand. In short, taxes didn't matter.

Supply-side economics showed that taxation—and government spending—also affect incentives and relative prices and that the results are not washed out the way demand effects are when spending is transferred from the private to the government sector. The disincentive effect of the higher tax rate remains. As government grows, the incentives to produce decline. This accumulation of disincentives led to stagflation and worsening trade-offs between inflation and unemployment, as successive raises in government spending called forth weaker increases in real output and stronger increases in prices.

A few diehards have tried to explain the record five-year Reagan expansion as a deficit-fueled Keynesian consumption binge. But these polemicists have not explained why the Reagan expansion was noninflationary. Why did smaller deficits lead to worsening inflation for Carter, while larger deficits were accompanied by declining inflation under Reagan? There was a bad recession from 1974 to 1975, but it was not followed by a five-year expansion with falling inflation. Clearly, something else has been going on.

TAX CUT MOVEMENTS.

The strong position of supply-side economics is further bolstered by developments all over the world. Heavily socialized countries such as Britain and France have reversed course and undertaken extensive privatization. France, traditionally the most statist of the developed countries, has abolished price and exchange controls and cut tax rates for individuals and businesses. There is not a country in Western Europe today that does not have a strong tax-cut movement.

In Third World countries, there is a widespread revulsion against development planning and its legacy of massive debts, corrupted economies and demoralized political systems. In China and the Soviet Union, the repudiation of central planning is further indication that the growth of government in the 20th century has exceeded its natural boundaries. Governments everywhere are saddled with massive responsibilities that they no longer want and cannot meet. The market for statist economies, which finds the answer to every problem in more government interference in the economy, has simply disappeared.

This is a great source of frustration to ideologues in Ivy League universities. It is not Keynesian economists who are dissatisfied with the supply-side emphasis on incentives, but the left-wing egalitarians in their midst. An economic theory in which incentives are important justifies income inequality, which leftist ideologues can't abide. The inability of leftwing economists to find any political allies is the telltale sign of supply-side supremacy.

[From the Atlanta Journal, Jan. 31, 1988]

TO FINISH THE TAX REVOLUTION, CUT THE RATE ON CAPITAL GAINS

You can't argue with success—unless, of course, you're a congressman. Democratic congressmen argued that President Reagan's reduction of tax rates would bring in less revenue. It brought in more.

Democrats argued that a lower tax rate on capital gains would produce fewer tax receipts. Experience shows it produces more.

Reagan restated his support for a lower tax rate on capital gains in his State of the Union address. Lower rates on capital gains would not be a boon to the wealthy. Demo-

crats said the same thing about lower regular tax rates, but lower tax rates on the rich brought thousands of them out of the closet. The number of taxpayers reporting incomes of \$1 million increased 267 percent. The number reporting incomes of \$100,000 rose 87 percent. The net windfall spilled into the U.S. Treasury.

Lowering the rate on capital gains, which are gains from stocks, real estate and other property, will produce the same effect. A lower tax rate will generate more tax dollars; a higher rate will generate fewer.

For instance, Congress increased the tax rate on capital gains in 1969. Revenues from the higher rate plummeted 40 percent. Congress cut the rate in 1978. Revenues swelled 44 percent. The rate was cut again in 1981. Again, revenues soared.

But Congress still bickers with success. Learning nothing from experience, in 1986 it increased the capital-gains rate from 20 to 28 percent. Harvard economist Lawrence Lindsay says the higher rate will cost the Treasury up to \$105 billion over five years.

The solution? Cut the rate, as President Reagan proposes. Lindsay pegs the "ideal" rate at 18 percent. He predicts revenues will rise 72 percent from the tax cut.

Too, Congress should restore the special tax preference for long-term capital gains, and in the process restore stability to the financial markets. The preference was dropped in 1986, leaving rates on both short- and long-term gains the same. Investors took the quick profits since they carried no tax penalty, in the process sparking much of the commotion on Wall Street. Restoring the special preference to long-term gains will—in addition to generating more federal revenue—add some needed stability to the financial markets.

It's about time the Democrats and naysayers quit quarreling with success. They predicted the rich would pay less in taxes; the rich have paid more. They predicted a lower capital gains tax would bring in less revenue; experience shows it will bring in more. The success of Reagan's tax revolution is obvious. His last and most important element—cutting the tax rate on capital gains—needs to be put into place.

MIKE ROTUNNO—SHIP-TO-SHORE EXPERT

HON. GEORGE J. HOCHBRUECKNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1988

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to call to the attention of my colleagues the lifetime accomplishments of a remarkable man, Michael Rotunno of Southampton, NY. Mr. Rotunno will celebrate his 80th birthday on February 17, and it seems an appropriate benchmark for recognizing his unusual talents and experiences, especially as a ship-to-shore radio operator for over 60 years.

In this age of high technology and advanced communications, it is somehow very calming to know of this individual who devoted his life to excellence in ship-to-shore radio communications. The one-on-one relationships Mike Rotunno developed throughout the world with colleagues in the radio business, and others, have contributed to the saving of

lives, the security of our country, and much peace of mind for people in distress.

Mike Rotunno first took to the sea as a 19-year-old radio operator in 1927, and came to Southampton with Mackay Radio—of ITT—in 1930. He served as the chief radio operator on the *Minnekahda* at age 20, and took the *Excalibur*—with 2,000 on board—on its maiden voyage 3 years later. Throughout his long career he has traveled by ship as an operator to every continent except Australia, and never missed 1 day of work in 40 years with Mackay. He still remembers the call letters of every ship with which he was ever in contact.

There are a thousand entertaining stories Mike can tell of his exploits, but a few stand out as highlights:

In World War II he received the message about a German submarine off Amagansett, Long Island, and provided communication links leading to the ultimate capture of three Germans from the sub who had sneaked onto the beach and taken a train to New York City;

He handled all the distress signals from the sinking *Andrea Doria*, and was the last person to receive a message from its captain, as the ship was going down;

During Admiral Byrd's second expedition, Mike Rotunno communicated with him by radio for 1 year;

More recently, an emergency phone call from a rural part of France conveyed only partial information about a very serious car crash involving the son of some long-time Southampton residents. From the phone call, the family now frantic, didn't know if their son was alive or dead, or where they could get more information. Mr. Rotunno connected with a fellow operator on a ship off the coast of France, found someone who had witnessed the crash scene, and within a few hours was able to call with the good news that the young man was badly injured, but alive.

There are not many people who can claim to have lived in Southampton for nearly 60 years. Mike Rotunno remembers much about this charming town before the sands literally shifted and shaped it into the popular resort community of today. He has served as a deputy sheriff, is an active member of the Knights of Columbus, and of the Southampton Association. In the summertime, he reports regularly for work at the Southampton Bathing Corp., and fulfills his love for deep sea fishing as a member of the Fisherman's Club and the Hamptons Surf Club.

Mr. Speaker, Michael Rotunno was once honored by Mackay Radio as "the best radio operator they ever had." May I suggest that he is the best Southampton has ever had. Indeed, he is the stuff from which the best of our Nation is made. With his zest for life and amazing recall, there will be many more birthdays and opportunities to hear Mike Rotunno's fascinating stories. For now, I know you will join me in congratulating him and his family on the occasion of his 80th birthday.

TRIBUTE TO LARRY AND SUE STAMPER

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1988

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to two extraordinary members of my community, Larry and Sue Stamper. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring these two friends for their dedicated service and great contribution to their community. The Stampers will be honored for their work with the Burbank Community Hospital at the hospital's annual Orchid Ball on March 5.

Larry Stamper has devoted his life to helping and serving others. Since 1959, he has studied theology and served as a Methodist minister in southern California. Presently he is the pastor of the Burbank First United Methodist Church. For more than 10 years, Reverend Stamper has served as chaplain for the Burbank Police Department. Larry has also served the Burbank community through his involvement in local government. In 1981, he was elected to the city council of Burbank and, in 1983, he served as a member of the board of Pacific Home of Burbank/Burbank Homes, Inc. He is also a member of the board of trustees for Burbank Community Hospital as well as the board of directors of the Verdugo Hills Council, Boy Scouts of America. Through these positions, Larry has been a significant and positive force in shaping the Burbank community.

In addition to juggling a family and a career, Sue Stamper has served the Burbank community as an active member of many local service organizations. While raising three children, Sue also pursued a career in banking and she is now the assistant vice president of Highland Federal Bank. Despite this busy schedule, Sue has always found time for volunteer and charity work. She is a member and past president of Friendly House Affiliates, a charitable organization supporting a home and rehabilitation center for alcoholic women. Sue is also a member of the National Charity League of Burbank, Burbank Kiwanitis, P.E.O., and Zonta, a service club for business and professional women. Sue has contributed much of her time to the Burbank Community Hospital as a member of the Orchid Ball Committee.

It is my honor and pleasure to thank and pay tribute to Larry and Sue Stamper who have given so much of their time and energy to serving their community. The citizens of Burbank have benefited greatly from this couple's dedication and involvement.

REPRESENTATIVE MILLER SALUTES SPECIAL OLYMPICS

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1988

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I know that Members of the House of Representatives will want to join in saluting the Contra Costa County Special Olympics Pro-

gram on its 20th anniversary of service to the people—and especially the children—of California.

As we await the opening of the winter Olympic games in Calgary, we also must note the achievements of the young men and women who, over the years, have been such competitive athletes in the Special Olympics. I'm honored to have had a long relationship with these young athletes, and with the outstanding directors of the Contra Costa Program.

In particular, I want to salute the board of directors of the Contra Costa Special Olympics, including Dr. Michael Grimes, who has been a very close personal friend for many years, as well as James B. Beckum, Howard B. Folkman, Dorothy G. Folkman, Bob DuRee, James Ginsbach, Lorie W. Hudson, Bob Kaemper, Doris Kaemper, Susan Klas, Sandy Stanley, Peter Wilson, Carl Dobratz, and area director Sunny Gramont. Each of these board members has added immensely to the lives of all the Special Olympic participants in Contra Costa County.

Special Olympics provides a unique opportunity for disabled children to enjoy the activity, the competition, and the skill that is part of being a dedicated athlete. Special Olympic participants exemplify the ideals of sportsmanship, because they compete not merely to win, but to enjoy and benefit from the process.

Those who help to organize the Special Olympics also exemplify these ideals. They provide an example of generous self-sacrifice and leadership for all to follow.

Special Olympics has grown phenomenally since its formation in 1968 with a national meet for 1,000 athletes cosponsored by the Kennedy Foundation and the Chicago Park and Recreation District. Today approximately one and a half million athletes participate in Special Olympics nationwide. The program has enjoyed similar success in Contra Costa County.

This Saturday, the Contra Costa County Special Olympics will hold a 20th anniversary dinner in Concord, CA, and I know that my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives join me in congratulating all of the participants over the years, and in extending our deep appreciation to the director, trainers, volunteers, and financial supporters who make this very valuable community activity a great success for the young athletes year after year.

CONTINUED HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS IN EAST GERMANY

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1988

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, to my dismay, East German authorities have begun another crackdown against human rights, environmental and peace activists. According to reports, approximately 150 activists joined a recent demonstration commemorating the 1919 murder of German Communist Party founders Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht. Some of the individuals displayed a placard reading

true freedom is the freedom to dissent. Charges against these individuals range as high as treason.

Why, simply for peacefully expressing their beliefs, should people be punished? Freedom of speech is a basic right of individuals, guaranteed under numerous international documents, and accepted by the German Democratic Republic as a signatory to the Helsinki accords.

Two months ago, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 228 urging the German Democratic Republic to resolve the pending cases against four persons who were arrested while working in the basement of the Zion Church. I was extremely pleased that the German Democratic Republic released these individuals the very afternoon my resolution was introduced.

Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleagues that House Concurrent Resolution 228 also calls upon the German Democratic Republic to initiate no further reprisals against individuals for peacefully expressing their views, and to continue expanding the positive steps recently taken in the area of human rights. I encourage the German Democratic Republic authorities to immediately free the remaining individuals, as reports indicate, and to reexamine their attempt to squelch dissent in East Germany. The thousands of East German individuals protesting outside churches throughout the country should signal to the German Democratic Republic Government that severe restrictive measures are no longer accepted by their citizens, or by the rest of the world.

SIGNIFICANT IMPROVEMENTS MADE TO HOUSE TELEPHONE SYSTEM

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1988

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to update our colleagues on some important improvements which have been made in the telephone system being installed in the U.S. House of Representatives. As you may recall, in the past I expressed my frustrations with the new telephone system. It is only proper, therefore, that I take similar steps to let you know when things are going right.

I am pleased to report that since the time I expressed my concerns with the telephone system I have had several meetings with the House employees who are implementing the changeover in telephone systems and with representatives of AT&T. In every instance these individuals have been attentive to my suggestions for improvements and have worked with me and my staff to make the necessary modifications.

My concerns focused on specific types of service and options under the new telephone system. Previously Members had different telephone systems in their offices depending in part on what levels of service they felt met their individual needs. When I was first elected, I made the decision to have an advanced telephone system in my offices. Accordingly, I

selected AT&T's Merlin system. I was very impressed with the Merlin system and was frustrated to lose some of its features under the new House system.

I am pleased to report now, however, that nearly all of the features I desired have either been incorporated into the House system or will soon be added. In fairness, I should also add that I am impressed with some of the features which will soon be added to the House system which were not available with the Merlin system.

Mr. Speaker, I recognize that inevitably there will be "bugs" that must be worked out any time a major system like the House telephone system is converted. The critical factor in making a conversion successful is the dedication and attention that those responsible for the system show in trying to meet the needs of the system's individual users. In this critical area, AT&T and the staffs of the Committee on House Administration and of the Clerk of the House have been extremely responsive. Together, they have successfully met most of my concerns and needs.

I want to take this opportunity to publicly thank Chairman CHARLIE ROSE, Clerk of the House DONN ANDERSON, and the people of AT&T for their commitment to service and for meeting the needs of individual Members of Congress. Their attention to the problems and the ensuing changes are a good example of what American ingenuity and commitment can achieve.

POLLUTION LIABILITY

HON. JOHN MILLER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1988

Mr. MILLER of Washington. Mr. Speaker, today environmental and maritime experts are working furiously to clean up one of the largest oil spills ever in Puget Sound.

In the early morning hours of Sunday, January 31, a 176-foot fuel barge loaded with over 300,000 gallons of heavy fuel oil capsized and sank in the Guemes Channel of Puget Sound. Since February 4 over 46,000 gallons of the sunken barge's toxic fuel has leaked out and been swept into the waters of Puget Sound.

The Guemes Channel is home to some of the swiftest tidal currents in my State—further complicating an already dangerous and difficult cleanup job. During the next week, expert divers with the help of a 600-ton derrick will be attempting to raise the barge without spilling anymore of its hazardous cargo.

Mr. Speaker, accidents happen. And it is important to point out that this problem is not unique to my district. Recently, other major oil spills have been reported on the Monogahela River, in the Delaware River, in Savannah Harbor and in Cook Inlet, AK. Shorelines are damaged, fisheries and wildlife habitat contaminated, businesses are disrupted and people living near the spill are inconvenienced.

Environmentalists and other concerned citizens want to know if there is a Federal law to set responsibilities for cleaning up oil spills, or compensating lost business opportunities, or

providing for safe drinking water? I must answer—not yet. Presently, Federal law places too much responsibility on the Federal Government's role for cleaning up spills and not enough on those who cause the spills.

We need to worry about the costs of providing safe drinking water supplies, and providing relief for those who suffer economic losses.

There is an answer. It is H.R. 1632, the Comprehensive Oil Pollution Liability and Compensation Act. This bill will establish a new comprehensive set of rules that will provide prompt, adequate and equitable compensation for those who suffer from oil spills.

H.R. 1632 will also encourage prompt clean up of oil spills and create mechanisms to reimburse Federal, State and local governments for the costs cleaning up a spill. It would impose strict "joint and several" liability for those transporting or producing oil and make other long needed reforms. H.R. 1632 would also establish a clear and predictable legal and regulatory framework for claimants, spillers, insurers and government officials.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, which I serve on, and the Committee on Public Works have been working on this bill for almost a decade. It has widespread support from the administration, from industry, from environmental groups and coastal States. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this important bill and to join in supporting it.

RUNNING FROM REALITY

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1988

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, every once in a while, the left-wing foreign policy establishment reveals its true colors. Presidential candidate ALBERT GORE seems to be the only candidate of his party to be in the mainstream of American thought. According to the Washington Post, every other candidate at a recent debate believes that the Soviets signed the INF Treaty because they were experiencing economic difficulties.

Michael Kramer of U.S. News & World Report recently asked: "Can any competent student of Soviet affairs seriously argue that an INF Treaty would exist today if Reagan hadn't insisted on placing Pershing 2 missiles in Europe?" Maybe Mr. Kramer should ask whether any candidate for the Presidency should be taken seriously if he doesn't believe that pressure works with the Soviets.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 31, 1988]

GORE TOUTS HIS "STRENGTH"

Sen. Albert Gore Jr. (D-Tenn.) has opened up a new front in his war to establish himself as the only "strength" Democrat running for president. At a debate Friday night in Sioux Falls, S.D., he asked former senator Gary Hart whether Hart believes the U.S. deployment of medium-range missiles in Europe, a policy conceived by President Jimmy Carter and carried out by President Reagan, was responsible for the Soviets' agreeing to the INF Treaty.

For Reagan to take credit for the INF, Hart replied, "is like the rooster taking credit for the dawn." He said he believes the Soviets had wanted to negotiate away their medium-range missiles in Europe years ago, and their decision had nothing to do with deployment of the medium-range and short-range missiles. The other Democrats at the debate did not disagree, all saying that the Soviets' foundering economy drove them to the table.

"I find [this] difficult to believe," Gore said, savoring a distinction he is sure to draw as he campaigns through the South. "Do you really think the Soviets just said to themselves, 'We're feeling some economic pressure: Let's remove our SS20s?'"

[From U.S. News & World Report, Feb. 1, 1988]

TIME FOR A "YES" VOTE ON CONTRA AID (By Michael Kramer)

Take a moment and think about the value of pressure in international relations. Consider two examples:

Despite Moscow's internal economic problems, can any competent student of Soviet affairs seriously argue that an INF treaty would exist today if the Reagan administration hadn't insisted on placing Pershing 2 missiles in Europe? If the allies had had nothing to trade, would the Kremlin have unilaterally dismantled its intermediate nuclear forces out of the goodness of its heart?

Similarly, on their southern flank, would the Soviets be eager to quit Afghanistan simply because Russian mothers sleep better if their sons aren't occupying another country? If the United States hadn't backed the mujaheddin rebels to the point where Afghanistan has become a Vietnam-style quagmire for Moscow, would Mikhail Gorbachev be planning a pullout simply for altruistic reasons?

The answer to these questions is obvious, or should be: Pressure—and often *only* pressure—works.

Now consider the Nicaraguan situation. Contra aid faces another crucial vote next week. Congressional opponents of renewed assistance say the Sandinistas have seen the light. The comandantes, they argue, have agreed to speak directly to the Contras (which they had previously refused to do), lift the state of emergency in Nicaragua and grant a conditional amnesty to political prisoners essentially because they are well-intentioned folks who would have "made nice" long ago if the Contras hadn't been nipping at their heels.

This is the view, too, of the Democrats running for President (new crowd, old tune)—candidates, in Jeane Kirkpatrick's admittedly demagogic phrase, who always seem to blame America first. And, of course, their critique is 180 degrees wrong. There is a connection between the INF treaty, Afghanistan and the chances for peace in Central America—a common thread: By their own, proud admission, the Sandinistas are dedicated Communists committed to spreading their Marxist-Leninist ideology throughout the region they inhabit. That they now may be moderating their thinking and behavior at all—an iffy proposition at best—is a result of the pressure, both real and prospective, that the Contras have been able to apply.

HOW THE SANDINISTAS PLAY THE GAME

The Sandinistas must be chuckling. Last week, after they announced their "concessions"—which they promised to renounce if Washington continues aid to the Contras—

Nicaragua's Foreign Minister was asked if the comandantes were loosening their iron fist for tactical reasons: In order to influence Congress to reject further Contra assistance. "Of course," answered Miguel D'Escoto, a confident practitioner of pressure in perfect sync with his audience. Congress's Democrats, you see, are still anxious to kill off the one factor that has caused the comandantes to move off square one.

Why is the obvious course—keeping the Contras alive—even a matter of debate? Part of the blame rests squarely with the Reagan administration. Over seven years, the White House has squandered its credibility with respect to Central America. It has lied to Congress, shifted its goals and misread the mood inside Nicaragua. The upside is that the Sandinistas have been contained and that the time bought by that containment has permitted the consolidation of democracy elsewhere in the region, most notably in El Salvador. But President Duarte's limited success there—and the fragility of representative government in Guatemala and Honduras—only raises the stakes further if the Contras are disbanded.

ARIAS'S FALLBACK: A FEW GOOD MEN

Today's anti-Contra lobby echoes an earlier naïveté when Americans, circa 1979, actually believed that Thomas Jefferson was the Sandinista patron saint. "Give peace a chance," they now say. "Trust the latest democratic pronouncements of Nicaragua's President, Daniel Ortega." If we're wrong, says House Democratic Whip Tony Coelho, then the four other Central American Presidents will come to us and "seek some help—and we should give it to them."

What kind of help? Oscar Arias, the Costa Rican President who authored the current peace proposal, has told friends that an invasion by the U.S. Marines would fit the bill. Which is fine for him to say. He's not talking about Costa Ricans making Central America safe for democracy; he's talking about our boys doing the job, the same job the Contras—native Nicaraguans—are willing to do themselves.

Even the most politically blind should feel queasy about the Sandinistas' latest good-guy promises and should welcome the Contras as an insurance policy. Cut them off now, and they will be gone for good. Once disbanded, a guerrilla force—no matter how dedicated—is next to impossible to reconstitute. And once a nation like the United States has turned its attention elsewhere, it doesn't want to hear that a problem deemed "solved" is still an open wound.

The prudent course for Congress, then, is to keep the Contras alive. Any one of a number of proposals will suffice. Two of these—humanitarian assistance, or military aid held in escrow against a determination of the Sandinistas' sincerity—would get the job done. If we don't do at least this—and it really isn't all that much—where will we complain if things turn sour? The United Nations?

If the Contras die, the Sandinistas will be free to reimpose the near-Stalinist measures they claim to be forgoing and to fulfill their "historical imperative" by striking out against their neighbors. And then Oscar Arias will be right: Only the Marines will be left as an available counterforce, assuming whoever is President has the stomach to send them in—a bet even a loser like Jimmy the Greek wouldn't take.

BRAVERY AT SEA—A MERCHANT MARINER'S STORY

HON. GEORGE J. HOCHBRUECKNER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1988

Mr. HOCHBRUECKNER. Mr. Speaker, last month the Secretary of the Air Force issued an order that awarded veteran's status to any person who served on a U.S.-flag oceangoing merchant ship between December 7, 1941, and August 15, 1945. This long-awaited ruling, a reversal of the administration's previous position on the matter, will enable World War II merchant seamen to receive the same pension, medical, and other benefits as veterans.

I am a cosponsor of legislation that would have granted veterans status to merchant seamen who served during the Second World War. I believe this legislative effort encouraged the military to reverse its previous position on the matter. Now that this issue has been resolved, Congress may proceed with the task of authorizing appropriate medals to honor these brave Americans.

A constituent of mine, Capt. A. Ralph Strong of Southampton, NY, has shared with me his experience as a member of the U.S. Merchant Marine during World War II. Captain Strong, who was awarded the Mariners Medal for Bravery after the war, has an inspiring story to tell. It is a story of patriotism. I want to give Members of Congress and the American people the opportunity to learn of this example of bravery, and ask that Mr. Strong's recent letter to me appear in the RECORD at this point:

JANUARY 20, 1988.

Mr. GEORGE J. HOCHBRUECKNER,
U.S. House of Representatives, Longworth
Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR SIR: I am writing to you to urge you to support the passage of Bills H.R. 1235 and H.R. 1430. To provide benefits to merchant seamen who served in the United States merchant marine during World War II; and to authorize decorations, medals, and other recognition for service in the United States merchant marine, and for other purposes.

For years the men who served our country so well during the World War II campaigns have been overlooked by the government and various organizations. The officers and men who navigated the ships of the merchant marine in wartime so bravely were perplexed to be passed over by the government and other organizations for recognition in their devotion to duty in all sorts of battles and attacks at sea. The military men (U.S. gun crews) on board merchant marine ships were praised and honored for their participation and bravery, but not the civilian ship officers and men who were in command.

I served in the merchant marine for 50 years (1930-1980) starting out as a cadet for 4 years, becoming an officer on various vessels and raising my license grades through 14 years to become Ship Master.

I joined an American company, the United Fruit Company, in 1938 (Pier #3, North River, New York, in those days). The company operated passenger and refrigerated freight ships, and the fleet numbered about 50 ships. This fleet served world-wide during World War II. Many ships and officers and

men were lost in this war when the ships were subjected to vicious attacks by German U-boats, planes, shells, mines, sabotage, and explosions due to collisions in convoy. These ships were first coming under attack in 1939 while still in peace-time service, sailing from U.S. ports on the east and west coasts, Gulf of Mexico and Caribbean. The German U-boats were active in blockading the U.S. east coast and the Gulf of Mexico and sinking oil tankers transporting oil from Texas to east coast refineries. So United Fruit Company vessels were sailing without any armaments or means to protect themselves, except by virtue of their speed and evasive action and were at the mercy of these undersea predators who were most aggressive and vicious. Many of our vessels were running with "dummy" guns in view for months and being attacked. There were many ships lost within 2 years. The U.S. Navy did not possess suitable patrol craft to cope with this situation and small yachts were commandeered for spot patrols. The subs would destroy vital navigation aids by gunfire, etc., and lie in wait for vessels to appear, showing light characteristics of the "aid" and then sink the ship.

Some of these subs would submerge and then raise up under men struggling in the sea and throw them off their decks.

My company fleet lost approximately 28 ships during World War II and many officers and men. The passenger ships had been taken over at once for naval transports. These merchant marine personnel, by nature of their time and work involved, were by far the most efficient found anywhere. "An army travels on its stomach" and it was the merchant marine who kept them supplied with food, armaments, etc. (Our U.S. merchant marine is so depleted now that I doubt that we could supply and support our army in a European ground war).

Unions were beginning to become active in the merchant marine sponsored by Joe Curran and Paul Hall (SIU). However, such organizations were not very strong in 1939 and, eventually, some shipping companies, including the United Fruit Co., had their own organizations to represent the personnel and they never did join any of the unions.

Many U.S. shipping firms maintained a certain portion of their fleets under foreign flags. These ships had U.S. masters, engineers and radio officers. This was started mainly to prevent seaman unions from delaying the operation of vessels carrying, for instance, perishable cargo, such as the cargoes carried by the United Fruit vessels. About one-third of our fleet was sailing under Panama or Honduras flags but, otherwise as an entity of the U.S. Merchant Marine.

In June, 1942, things were very acute for shipping on the east coast and gulf shores. My company had to shift operations from New Orleans (a large passenger and freight business) to Tampa due to sub attacks at the mouth of the Mississippi River passes.

Ships were not supposed to sail along east coast areas at night. Some sections had anti-sub nets and ships would run from one net to another, if possible. One time, we were supposed to use a net off Florida. Upon arrival, this was not available, and so we continued along coast and were attacked by sub off Palm Beach on a moonlight night. We managed to reach shallow water in time, by evasive action.

By the end of February, 1942, we were fitted with some guns at Baltimore and

sailed the same route to Central America. One gunnery chief and 8 naval ratings were assigned to our ship. The vessel was still engaged in peacetime service. While in the Gulf of Mexico, in June, the ship was attacked by a submarine (100' SE of Brownsville, Texas, buoy) at 2025 on a dark night. The first torpedo missed. Another one hit the stern where the magazine for the after 3" 50 gun was located. This blew up and the stern of the vessel was destroyed. Within 10 minutes the vessel capsized and left a few survivors struggling in the sea. Not one of the 4 lifeboats was seen in the dark. Gradually, crew members still alive found 2 make-shift rafts. I was chief officer and the senior one in charge, the captain having gone down with the ship. Only the third officer and the radioman were officer complement surviving. Of the 9 navy men, only 2 got to the rafts. Altogether, there were 14 of us surviving from a complement of 45. After two weeks awash on two rafts, with very little food (I lost 35 pounds), we were rescued by a PBV flying boat out of Corpus Christi Naval Air Station. They were a combined training/search grid mission at the time. The submarine had been using us for bait most of the time. The PBV fired a depth charge at them but there was no way of knowing if it hit them (sure hope it did!) On the 6th day, one injured crew member died and we had an "at sea" burial.

I was incapacitated for approximately 1 year due to injuries and the effect of this ordeal.

Upon returning to duty in April, 1943, I was assigned by my company to a vessel which was loading ammunition at Cavan Point (near the Statue of Liberty)—these were block busters for Liverpool. The vessel was under the Honduran flag, United Fruit Co. owned, but operated for all intents and purposes as U.S. ship as were all such units in the company. We were able to do 15 knots speed which was fairly fast in those days. The subs were able to do over 18 knots by then and were patrolling and attacking in wolf packs hitting the convoys. We eventually set out with orders to proceed singly, with no escort, with the vital but dangerous cargo across the Atlantic.

Later crossings were made in many convoys both to England and the continent with many collisions, sub attacks, plus mine-field dangers involved. One of the United Fruit Co. managed vessels (a Liberty ship) was proceeding in a convoy from New York to England. Usually, other segments would meet the N.Y. Group as they progressed northeastward. While meeting the Nova Scotia group in that area in fog, they collided with a tanker loaded with 100 octane aviation gas. Both vessels exploded and all were lost. United Fruit Captain Lundy from New Orleans and crew were buried at Cape Breton, Nova Scotia.

In May of 1944, my ship was proceeding eastward from Buoy "A" (Hudson River Canyon) bound for Europe with a full cargo of Army frozen meat (18 degrees F.) This was a fast convoy consisting of 30 vessels including 3 refrigerated food vessels, 6 Jeep aircraft carriers ferrying military planes and 21 oil tankers (mostly the T2 type) carrying aviation gas. There were 6 new U.S. Navy destroyers as escort, with radar, and progress was at 14 knots in 2 columns. South of Long Island, visibility was poor due to fog. At about 2000, a tanker approached at a 45 degree angle and collided with us tearing out a huge hole on our port side. The tanker was the "Sag Harbor". Fortunately, we didn't hit him! He hit us! Other-

wise, all would have been lost. Our buoyant, frozen cargo saved our ship and we were able to limp back to New York.

I was in convoys to the Mediterranean—North Africa, Algiers, Tunis, Sardinia, Sicily, Italy, without any break except about 10 days in U.S. between trips but still on duty, managing the vessel. All this on a patriotic, voluntary duty.

Sometimes, the question of remuneration to merchant marine officers and men is mentioned. The rates of income were not very high in the shipping industry during the war. A shipmaster was receiving about \$450. per month. Various areas of the world, which were considered more hazardous involved the consideration of a bonus. The accumulation of the privileges, benefits and honor received by the United States veteran of this war, far exceed any considerations or monetary remuneration accorded men who served their country voluntarily in the Merchant Marine during World War II.

There is only a small percentage of these brave men still alive and those still living will be mostly in their 70's and 80's. It is a long time for the recognition of the contribution made by the American Merchant Marine and it is only fair that these men receive, even at this late date, their well-earned praise and benefits.

After the war, I received from Admiral E. S. Land, Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, the Mariner's Medal for Bravery.

Respectfully,

Capt. A. RALPH STRONG.

Southampton, New York.

TRIBUTE TO STEPHEN AND NANCY WILSHINSKY

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1988

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute Chabad of the Valley and two extraordinary individuals, Stephen and Nancy Wilshinsky. Stephen and Nancy will be honored at a banquet on March 13, 1988, in recognition of their outstanding service to the community of the San Fernando Valley.

Chabad of the Valley is a Jewish educational and outreach organization which operates schools, summer camps, senior citizen, and youth programs and a host of beneficial social service programs. During the first 15 years of its existence, Chabad of the Valley has proven to be an exemplary organization which promotes a sense of values, morals, and ethics throughout the community. The organization is also a leading provider of social services for the troubled and needy.

Stephen and Nancy have played key roles in the past success of Chabad of the Valley and have supported many philanthropic causes over the past years. Stephen has assisted the less privileged not only during his free time, but has made a concerted effort to help the less privileged through his business contacts. While maintaining his position as a highly reputable broker in the stock brokerage firm of Bear, Sterns, & Co. he has utilized his shrewd financial and executive skills to help create programs for the needy.

Both Stephen and Nancy are well known for their generous contributions to numerous charitable organizations, both local and abroad. They have devoted a great deal of their time and energy to the problems of the needy in the community. Most noteworthy of their efforts is the opening of their home to house orphaned children, while also sustaining a number of poverty stricken families. The Wilshinsky's have been, and continue to be, shining examples of citizens who are not only concerned with the welfare of the community, but citizens who have succeeded in their efforts to make a difference.

It is my distinct pleasure to join Chabad of the Valley as it honors Stephen and Nancy for their outstanding contributions to the community of the San Fernando Valley.

CONGRESSIONAL MILITARY REFORM CAUCUS; 1987 ANNUAL REPORT TO THE COCHAIRMAN ON CAUCUS ORGANIZATION AND SPONSORED EVENTS

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1988

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself and Congressman TOM RIDGE, as co-chairmen of the Congressional Military Reform Caucus, we would like to submit to our colleagues the following staff report on the activities of the caucus during the past year.

This is a report to the cochairmen of the caucus that was prepared by the staff of the caucus. Since this is the first time recently that such a report has been prepared, it includes some additional general information about the caucus that may be helpful to those interested in learning more about its activities. Membership in the caucus is open to any Member of either body committed to strengthening and improving our national defense. There are no dues.

Although I realize that this statement is rather lengthy, I believe that it is important for it to appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for two reasons. First, as a quasi-official organization, the caucus should be open about its activities with other Members of Congress and the public. This report serves that purpose admirably. Second, the report is a serious effort to summarize many valuable activities of the caucus and, I believe, merits inclusion as part of the historical record.

The text of the staff report follows:

100TH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION ANNUAL STAFF REPORT TO THE COCHAIRMAN OF THE CONGRESSIONAL MILITARY REFORM CAUCUS

CONTENTS

- (I) Brief history and statement of general purpose.
- (II) Membership.
- (III) Cochairmen.
- (IV) Finances.
- (V) Panel discussions and briefings sponsored in 1987.
- (VI) Issues of special and legislative interest in 1987.

1. Conventional forces and conventional balance in Europe.
2. Infantry anti-tank weapons.
3. Bradley Fighting Vehicle.

4. Close air support.
5. Separation of operational and developmental testing.
6. Live-fire weapons testing.
7. Black programs.
8. Whistleblower protection.
9. Revolving door.

(I) BRIEF HISTORY AND STATEMENT OF GENERAL PURPOSE

The Caucus, founded in 1981, is an informal and bipartisan organization whose activities are intended to support the regular committee work for a stronger national defense.

The purpose of the Caucus is to achieve the strongest and most effective defense possible. The Caucus does not advocate overall increases or decreases in defense spending, only more effective expenditure of those dollars allocated for national defense. The specific action agenda of the Caucus has evolved over the years consistent with changing national events and the needs of the military, as perceived by the members and Cochairmen of the Caucus. During its early years, the Caucus emphasized issues such as maneuver warfare, reform of military organization and procurement reform. Later, procurement reform received additional emphasis while the Caucus helped lead efforts to pass several key procurement reforms. During the 100th Congress, the Caucus has ensured that those initiatives that were still approved were continued, and has added a primary emphasis on improving conventional forces, particularly in NATO Europe.

In stressing improvements in conventional forces and other military capabilities during the 100th Congress, the Caucus is guided by a philosophy that emphasizes that wars are fought by people, not just by weapons. Above all, the most important people in fighting those wars are the average soldiers, sailors and airmen who do the actual fighting, rather than administrative personnel, military bureaucrats or defense corporations. The Caucus seeks to improve the training, strategy and tactics of our conventional forces. It advocates lean armed forces that are not top heavy with administrative layers. These forces must be ready to fight immediately, and must have the basic supplies and weapons to sustain such conflict. Further, they should have weapons and supplies that are of the best quality that can be obtained. The Caucus desires to ensure the engineering excellence of our weapons by evaluating new weapons programs in terms of the soldiers who actually use them. It wants to increase weapon reliability in the chaos of war by "flying before we buy", i.e. by promoting tough, realistic weapons testing before weapons are purchased in production quantities. In a time of flat defense budgets, the Caucus believes that it is essential that hard choices be made, and that ineffective or unnecessary weapons systems be cancelled to ensure adequate funding for adequate numbers of those pieces of basic equipment and weapons that are badly needed. Finally, the Caucus hopes to increase the interest and awareness in Congress of issues which tend to be neglected in favor of higher profile issues during deliberations in either the Department of Defense or the regular congressional defense processes.

(II) MEMBERSHIP

During the 100th Congress, the membership of the Caucus has remained high, and currently includes 136 members of the House and Senate. Of this total, 27 are

members of the Senate and 109 are members of the House. Also, 78 are Democrats and 58 are Republicans.

(III) COCHAIRMAN

At the beginning of the 100th Congress, the members of the Caucus elected three Cochairmen.

The Democratic Chairman from the House of Representatives is Rep. Charles E. Bennett (D-Fla.) and the Republican Chairman from the House of Representatives is Rep. Tom Ridge (R-Pa.). Rep. Bennett is a decorated infantry combat veteran of the Pacific Theater of World War II, where he fought as an officer in New Guinea and the Philippines. Rep. Ridge is a decorated infantry combat veteran of the Vietnam War, where he fought as an enlisted man.

The Cochairman from the Senate is Sen. Charles Grassley (R-Iowa). Senator Grassley also served as Senate Cochairman during the 99th Congress.

(IV) FINANCES

The Caucus has no dues or budget. Incidental expenses for mailings and events are paid for out of the budgets of the Cochairmen. The Caucus is staffed by the staff of the Cochairmen.

(V) PANEL DISCUSSIONS AND BRIEFINGS SPONSORED IN 1987

In order to fulfill the Caucus' purpose of raising the level of interest and expertise among members of Congress and their staff in military reform issues, the Caucus during 1987 has sponsored a very active program of panel discussions and briefings. Because of limited resources, no transcripts of these events were made or are available. In a few cases, participants brought prepared statements, and copies of some of these may be available from the offices of the Cochairmen.

(1) "The Search for Close Air Support" panel discussion on close air support (November 17, 1987). This lively panel discussion between service representatives and independent experts explored whether close air support, the tactical air support of ground combat operations, requires increased attention from the Air Force and Army. See below for further discussion of this issue.

Panel members included: Chuck Myers, Aerocounsel, Inc.; Maj. General Thomas Carl Foley, U.S. Army; Brig. General Joseph W. Ralston, U.S. Air Force; and Pierre M. Sprey. Rep. Denny Smith moderated the discussion. Six defense contractors exhibited models of their respective close air support aircraft.

(2) "The Conventional Military Balance in Europe" panel discussion on the conventional military balance in NATO Europe (September 29, 1987). Three independent experts presented a spectrum of views on the conventional balance in Europe. See below for further discussion of this issue.

Panelists included: John M. Collins, Congressional Research Service; Joshua M. Epstein, Brookings Institution; and Michael L. Moodie, Center for Strategic and International Studies.

(3) "Can We Stop Soviet Tank Armies?" panel discussion on NATO antitank capabilities (July 29, 1987). Independent experts and an Army representative expressed varying views on the capabilities and needs of NATO's infantry anti-tank weapons. See below for further discussion of this issue.

Panelists included: Brig. General Mike Lynch, U.S. Army (Retired); Maj. General Wilson Shoffner, U.S. Army; Phillip Karber,

BDM Corp.; Pierre M. Sprey; and the moderator was David Evans, Chicago Tribune. Five defense contractors exhibited their anti-tank weapons.

(4) "A Discourse on Winning and Losing, Part I" staff briefing on military strategy (August 11, 1987). Col. John Boyd, U.S. Air Force (Retired) presented his well-known in-depth briefing on military strategy. This briefing has been given previously at the National War College and before many other audiences in the government and the military. Part II of this briefing will be presented in early 1988.

(5) "Letting Combat Results Shape the Next Air-to-Air Missile" staff briefing on use of air-to-air missiles in combat (June 22, 1987). Col. Jim Burton, U.S. Air Force (Retired) briefed staff on the results of his original research on actual use of air-to-air missiles in wars between 1963 and 1982. He concluded from his research that new air-to-air missiles should emphasize low cost, light weight and the ability to hit enemy planes within visual range using simple technologies.

(VI) ISSUES OF SPECIAL OR LEGISLATIVE INTEREST IN 1987

(1) Conventional forces and conventional balance in Europe:

The Caucus sponsored an excellent panel discussion on this subject in September where three experts provided different assessments of the balance.

The Caucus also supported legislation sponsored by Rep. Bennett, and cosponsored by more than 40 other members of the House. It was enacted as section 1212 of the Fiscal Year 1988 Defense Authorization Act. This amendment requires the Secretary of Defense to appoint a conventional defense advisory board in the Defense Department. The Board's purpose is to review a detailed study of the conventional defense situation, particularly in Europe, and to recommend ways to improve that conventional balance. The amendment also directs the General Accounting Office (GAO), Congressional Budget Office (CBO) and Congressional Research Service (CRS) to form a Study Group to assess the situation, and submit its findings to the Defense Department's Board. This amendment is particularly important since the proposed treaty on Intermediate Nuclear Forces (INF) will likely be ratified, thereby increasing the attention paid to our conventional forces in Europe.

At this date, the various congressional agencies in the Study Group have begun coordinating their work. They will run two workshops in March and April for members of Congress and staff in order to obtain the views of U.S. experts on the balance in NATO Europe and on Soviet perceptions of this balance. They will summarize the experts' views in a report to Congress and DOD on the strengths and weaknesses of NATO's conventional defenses and on recommended corrective actions.

In addition to these efforts to address the general issue of the conventional balance and conventional forces, the Caucus has several specific initiatives with the same aim of improving conventional forces. First, this connection is clear in the case of specific weapons systems, for example antitank weapons, the Bradley Fighting Vehicle or close air support aircraft. Infantry antitank weapons, especially, are one of the single most important areas where NATO can and should act to improve its position relative to the Warsaw Pact and other potential conventional opponents. Second, this connection

is also present in broader policy initiatives. For example, better weapons testing is absolutely necessary for good weapons quality. Also, revolving door conflict-of-interest prohibitions and whistleblower protections are necessary to ensure that decisions are made on the basis of true military needs, rather than extraneous factors.

(2) Infantry anti-tank weapons.

In addition to the panel discussion sponsored by the Caucus in July, the Caucus endorsed anti-tank amendments to the defense authorization that were successfully offered by Rep. Bennett and Rep. Ridge. The amendment by Rep. Bennett sought to assure that two different NATO anti-tank weapons received equal funding for operational tests by the U.S. Army. This equal funding was reflected in the conference report on the Fiscal Year 1988 Defense Authorization Act. The House also approved an amendment by Rep. Ridge requiring live-fire testing of various NATO anti-tank weapons, but this amendment was not contained in the conference report.

The Caucus has stressed that insufficient attention has been given to inadequacies in NATO's infantry anti-tank weapons. Tanks are key to Warsaw Pact offensive strategy. While it is neither necessary nor realistic to expect that NATO will spend the funds necessary to match the Warsaw Pact forces tank-for-tank, it is clear that well-targeted investments in infantry-portable anti-tank weapons can greatly improve the conventional balance.

Unfortunately, the GAO found in a report ("Antitank Weapons: Current and Future Capabilities", September 17, 1987, GAO/PEMD-87-22) that significant doubts exist as to the effectiveness of many U.S. anti-tank weapons against Soviet tanks. The report revealed that the Army has purchased and issued to its soldiers almost a million anti-tank weapons without adequately testing them in combat-like conditions. The report showed that the Army is relying on its infantry to use special tactics that may not always be practical, and that Army estimates of ability to kill Soviet tanks were unacceptably vague.

The conference report for the Fiscal Year 1988 Continuing Resolution included report language to implement this GAO report. The explanation of the conferees (p. 632) states:

"The conferees further direct the Department to modify the antiarmor master plan to incorporate the GAO recommendations for assessing and comparing the performance of antiarmor weapons."

Interested Caucus members have indicated that they continue to support operational tests on various anti-tank weapons, including the Bofors Bill and the Milan 2, and that they continue to support early action to address, on both an interim and long-term basis, the inadequacies in NATO infantry anti-tank weapons.

(3) Bradley Fighting Vehicle:

An amendment successfully offered by Caucus members Reps. Bennett, Boxer, Ridge, Denny Smith, Ron Wyden, Mel Levine, Albert Bustamante and Louise McIntosh Slaughter on the House floor was intended to fix once and for all the Army's newest armored troop carrier, the Bradley Fighting Vehicle. The conference retained this amendment. It was enacted as section 123 of the Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1988.

The amendment's sponsors said they were prompted by concerns that the troops who would be ordered into the Bradley for trans-

port to the front might be endangered by the vehicle's flaws. Analysts who have studied the Bradley have offered the following criticisms of the Bradley. In brief, the Bradley is expected to fight along side our tanks, but it is highly vulnerable to anti-tank rockets or shells. The vehicle had been designed so that troops sat surrounded by high explosive ammunition. The vehicle's water-fording, or "swim", capability seemed inadequate, and resulted in the death of one American Army soldier in training shortly after he had written home to complain about this quality. Also, the vehicle's electrical system breaks down frequently, crippling the gun. The transmission sometimes simply stops working, immobilizing the vehicle. Finally, these critical analysts have noted that there have been repeated allegations of lax quality control and other problems by former FMC Corporation employees and others.

As enacted, the amendment required the Army to report to Congress on how it plans to fix the Bradley so that the Bradley will be lethal to the enemy yet reasonably secure for our soldiers. In particular, it prohibited spending on more Bradley Fighting Vehicles until the Secretary of Defense completes testing the Bradley's problem areas and comes up with a plan to fix them. Numerous problems with the Bradley, which is designed to carry our infantry into battle, have been found but the Defense Department had still sought to keep buying more Bradleys before fixing them. The amendment does recognize that cost is a factor.

A hearing was held by the Armed Services Committee in November 1988 at which DOD reported on progress on addressing some of the concerns raised. At this hearing, the Army testified, and GAO agreed, that live fire testing of the Bradley "makes it clear" that improvements are needed. The Army is adopting some reconfigurations of the vehicle that will improve crew survivability. One controversial proposed improvement—adding 10,000 lbs. of reactive armor to the vehicle—is still under consideration by the Army. Also under consideration is a proposal to restow greater amounts of ammunition from inside the crew compartment to outside the vehicle—which may be an improvement. DOD witnesses said DOD now "strongly supports" live fire testing for all weapons systems.

The Army said that improvement programs are under way to fix the other reliability problems that have plagued this vehicle. Additionally, operational tests of the Bradley showed that, despite Army doctrine to the contrary, the Bradleys ended up fighting side-by-side with tanks in mock battles and, therefore, suffered heavy casualties. In scenarios where the Bradley's mobility was used, the crews were almost always inside the Bradley when hit. When the crews were outside the vehicle, they survived. But, as DOD tester John Krings testified, "Bradley drivers didn't fare too well because they're always in it."

Sponsors of the Bradley amendment have said that they continue to support full compliance with the law and in order to seek the safest vehicle for our soldiers that is reasonably possible.

(4) Close air support:

Under the leadership of Rep. Denny Smith and Rep. Ridge, the Caucus has closely followed military and DOD civilian actions on the issue of additional close air support aircraft, and it sponsored a panel discussion on the subject in November.

Apparently, DOD efforts to encourage the Air Force to study the need for, and possible design of, a close-air support aircraft resembling the so-called "mudfighter" seem to have failed.

Interested Caucus members have indicated that they continue to support considering the option of developing a "mudfighter" along with other alternatives already under consideration.

(5) Separation of operational and developmental testing:

The Caucus strongly supported the creation a few years ago of an independent operational testing office within DOD, and led legislative efforts during 1987 to preserve this vital independence.

With Public Law 98-94, Congress established in 1983 the office of the Director of Operational Testing and Evaluation (OT&E). This law explicitly stated that the Director and his staff "are independent of . . . all other officers and entities of the DOD responsible for research and development." Congress believed a separate office was critically necessary to improve the quality of weapons and military systems. As Senator Roth stated on the floor of the Senate during a 1986 debate:

"(before Congress created the new office) operational testing was controlled by the same man who controlled research, development and acquisition. And we had problems. We had cheating in tests; we had rigged tests; sometimes we had no tests; and often we had self-serving test analysis and reports influenced heavily by those who did not want to see their own handiwork objectively assessed."

For this reason, the original law also explicitly defined operational testing as field testing under realistic combat conditions, in order to distinguish it from developmental testing. Developmental testing is done under laboratory-type conditions with deep involvement by program managers and contractor personnel, and with the purpose of improving weapons under development. It is crucial that, after completion of developmental testing, some party outside the development process conduct a tough field test with the purpose of determining whether the weapon is really ready for production.

Because of this clear congressional intent, the Caucus objected to a plan by the Director of OT&E in 1987 for the administrative merger of testing offices, which would confuse testing functions and purposes. The Caucus backed an amendment to the Fiscal Year 1988 Defense Authorization bill sponsored by Rep. Denny Smith reiterating congressional intent that developmental and operational testing remain absolutely separate. This amendment was accepted by the House Armed Services Committee, and an identical amendment was included by the Senate Armed Services Committee in its version of the DOD bill. The final provision appears as section 801 of the conference report.

The Caucus noted from the publication of a memorandum that the Deputy Director of OT&E, Karl Pflock, and, apparently, the Director were seeking to revise the latest legislative ban on merger of the testing offices. On December 9, 1987, Sen. Grassley, Sen. David Pryor, Rep. Denny Smith, Rep. Ridge and Rep. Bennett all wrote Secretary of Defense Frank Carlucci asking that the Secretary act to prevent lobbying by the Director of OT&E and his staff in favor of the merger, and to make these persons aware of the seriousness and possible illegality of their actions.

The Caucus notes the clear support of Caucus member and House Armed Services Committee Chairman Les Aspin in this matter. He wrote in a letter of January 4, 1988 to the Cochairman his view on DOD's September 1987 proposal to Congress that developmental testing (DT) and initial operational testing (IOT) be grouped together. The letter states:

"While aggressive IOT is essential to a successful procurement, and IOT and DT should be complementary functions, it remains the intent of Congress that operational testing be independent of the developmental test functions. . . .

"While it is important to examine the DOD recommendations, on two recent occasions, the Congress has expressed—in law—its intention to maintain the independence of the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation."

Further, the GAO reported to the Cochairmen of the Caucus ("Testing Oversight: Improving But More is Needed", March 18, 1987, GAO/NSIAD-87-108BR) that DOT&E makes too few actual on-site observations of operational tests, that DOT&E relies far too heavily on military service test reports with little assessment of actual test results, and that DOT&E has not provided policy guidance for tests or maintained reliable records on its principal activities.

Interested Caucus members have stated that they continue to favor close oversight of this matter, as well as all necessary administrative and legislative actions to ensure that independent testing is preserved as Congress intended.

(6) Live-fire weapons testing:

The Caucus has long advocated tougher, more realistic testing of new weapons, and was previously instrumental in enactment of requirements that live-fire testing be satisfactorily completed before new munitions or systems can enter low rate initial production. The purpose of this requirement is to ensure that weapon systems really work—that they can either survive a hit by enemy ammunition or destroy an enemy target, depending on their mission. It is vital that our troops have weapons systems that are effective on the real battlefield, and not just under computer-simulated conditions.

A report by the U.S. General Accounting Office ("Live-Fire Testing: Evaluating DOD's Programs", August 1987, GAO/PEMD-87-17) found that the Pentagon continues to rely far too heavily on computer simulations in the laboratory when testing new weapons systems. The report stated that DOD program managers and officials have avoided adequately testing such systems with live ammunition under combat-type conditions, apparently because such realistic live-fire tests can threaten "business as usual" at the Pentagon.

The Caucus endorsed two amendments to the Fiscal Year 1988 Defense Authorization Act that were sponsored by Reps. Bennett and Bustamante in cooperation with DOD's Assistant Deputy Under Secretary for Live-Fire Testing. These amendments were enacted as section 802 of the Act. Section 802 toughened last year's law by extending its coverage to programs for the modification or upgrade of covered systems. The amendments also increased funding for this important Pentagon office, which had only one permanent employee until summer 1987.

The House Armed Services Committee Acquisition Policy Panel held a hearing September 10, 1987 on the GAO report and on

DOD's live fire testing programs. At that hearing, the DOD's director of live-fire testing provided a vivid example of the value of live-fire testing. He testified that in his opinion, if the U.S.S. STARK had gone through such testing, lives could probably have been saved when it was struck in the Persian Gulf by missiles. That ship had been designed "as best as was possible" at the time based on then-current design guidelines and calculations. But one attack in the real world revealed problems that designers simply did not and could not anticipate without tests using live ammunition. Indeed, after looking at the effects of the missile hits, a blue-ribbon Navy commission recommended making improvements in the U.S.S. STARK and all ships in its class because of design and equipment flaws. At the request of the Cochairman to the Navy and the conferees on the defense bill, the Defense Authorization bill provided \$64 million to make immediate corrections in the fleet.

Caucus policy is that the Office of Live-Fire Testing should receive adequate funding, staff, and authority to perform all necessary tests. As the Cochairmen stated in a letter to former Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger, previous lack of support for this office should not be used to justify claims that necessary tests delay the "normal" procurement process. Indeed, it would seem that anyone making such a claim misunderstands congressional intent in creating this office. A few good tests at the right point in the procurement process prevent enormous waste and later delay.

(7) Black programs:

Caucus members share the broad concern in Congress that highly classified (or so-called "black") programs have grown sharply in recent years without clear criteria to determine under which circumstances a program should be so classified. Therefore, the Caucus endorsed legislation to address this problem that was sponsored by Rep. Barbara Boxer and enacted as sections 1132 and 1133 of the Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1988.

Although the precise numbers are secret, there is concern that DOD's total black budget has grown enormously in recent years, by one estimate from about \$5 billion annually in Fiscal Year 1981 to about \$25 billion in Fiscal Year 1988. Some have even suggested that certain programs have been designated as black to prevent effective congressional oversight, or to hide cost overruns, technical problems, or even fraud. Indeed, few requirements existed ordering either justification or notification to members of Congress concerning designation of programs as "special access", or "black".

As enacted, section 1132 requires the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress each year by Feb. 1 a report on special access programs which specifies the total amount requested for special access programs and sets forth: (1) a brief description of each program; (2) a brief discussion of the milestones established for the program; (3) the actual cost of the program for each fiscal year during which that program has been previously been conducted; and, (4) the estimated total cost of the program and its cost for the succeeding four years. Furthermore, section 1132 requires reports to Congress to: (1) provide notice of the designation of new black programs or of changes in their status; (2) justify such designation; and, (3) provide notice of any waivers of the above requirements by the Secretary of Defense. Finally, section 1133 requires the Sec-

retary to report to the defense committees 60 days after enactment on the policy and criteria used for designating a program as black. It also requires GAO to study such report and report to the defense committees on its findings by April 1, 1988.

Caucus members have said that they will continue to monitor this issue as the various reports to Congress are received.

(8) Whistleblower protection:

The Caucus endorsed legislation introduced by Rep. Boxer (H.R. 1394) and cosponsored by over 100 members of the House that is aimed at providing better protection for military whistleblowers. The House approved similar legislation as a floor amendment to the Fiscal Year 1987 Defense Authorization bill, but it was dropped in conference. In November 1987, the House Armed Services Committee Acquisition Policy Panel held a hearing on this issue, and another hearing is expected in February 1988.

If enacted, H.R. 1394 would set a solid procedure whereby military whistleblowers who feel they have been harassed as a result of reporting waste or fraud to Congress or to the Inspector General could obtain review of their cases. Review would first come by the Inspector General, then by the appropriate service's board for correction of military records, and finally by appeal to the Federal Appeals Court (where there would be the possibility for judicial review de novo).

Caucus members have said that they will continue to seek enactment of this legislation, with any appropriate amendments, during the 100th Congress, so that members of the military who do their patriotic duty in reporting waste and fraud are not unfairly punished or even discouraged from coming forward.

(9) Revolving door:

The Caucus endorsed a minor clarifying amendment to "revolving door" legislation enacted during the 99th Congress after strong support from the Caucus.

The purpose of the law enacted last year was to reduce the temptation for conflict of interest on the part of DOD negotiators when dealing with defense contractors. That law bars any "primary representatives" of DOD from accepting employment with a contractor for a period of two years after such negotiators leave government service if the negotiators had substantial dealings with such contractor. DOD and defense contractors must report annually to Congress on persons leaving the Defense Department to work for defense contractors.

Because of concern about possible misinterpretation by DOD of the intention of last year's law, its sponsor, Rep. Bennett, offered a small amendment to the Fiscal Year 1988 Defense Authorization Act that was accepted by the Armed Services Committee. As enacted section 821 of this Act clarifies the issue by specifying that the prohibition applies not only to the government's most important "primary" negotiator, but also to any government negotiator on the program who was one of the "primary" negotiators in the sense of having significant responsibilities.

Interested Caucus members have said that they will continue to monitor reports and implementation by DOD, as well as compliance by military and contractor personnel.

REAUTHORIZING THE WALLOP-BREAUX TRUST FUND

HON. EARL HUTTO

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1988

Mr. HUTTO. Mr. Speaker, today I have joined my good friend, the chairman of the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, in cosponsoring legislation to reauthorize the Aquatic Resources Trust Fund, better known as the Wallop-Breaux Trust Fund, which expires this year.

The benefits that millions of Americans have enjoyed as a result of programs funded through the Wallop-Breaux Trust Fund are numerous. However, as with most legislation passed by the Congress, there is always room for improvement.

I appreciate the leadership our chairman and other members of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee are taking in this matter. While I am a cosponsor of the bill being introduced today, I must frankly say that it does not make several changes that I believe would improve the boating safety and fish restoration programs that are funded through Wallop-Breaux. However, this bill is a starting point and I will be working hard within the normal legislative process to try to improve it.

GLASNOST HAS NOT YET REACHED SOVIET JEWS

HON. MIKE SYNAR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1988

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, the present mood of "glasnost" in the Soviet Union offers a new opportunity to appeal to Soviet leaders on behalf of Jews who have requested permission to leave the U.S.S.R. in accordance with international law, and to recognize that those Jews who choose to remain have the same rights accorded every other Soviet nationality and religious minority.

As many as 400,000 Soviet Jews are reported to want permission to emigrate from the Soviet Union. Yet in 1987 barely 700 were allowed to leave each month; 8,155 Soviet Jews emigrated during 1987. This compares to a high of 51,000 that received exit visas in 1979. Glasnost has not yet reached Jews in the Soviet Union.

Soviet refusal to provide free emigration is a violation of the Helsinki accords, of which the Soviet Union is a signatory. Violations of the human rights of these Soviet citizens stands as an obstacle preventing us from breaking down the walls of misunderstanding between our countries. The progress we have begun to make in arms reductions should give us confidence that we can make progress in other important areas of United States-Soviet relations.

Concern for Soviet Jewry is most definitely on the agenda of the 100th Congress. I am a cosponsor of legislation—House Concurrent Resolution 34—which criticizes continued

Soviet violation of its international human rights obligations, especially the right to emigrate. This measure passed the House March 31, 1987 by a unanimous vote of those present.

Members of Congress have sent hundreds of different appeals to General Secretary Gorbachev on behalf of individual Soviet citizens seeking to emigrate. These individuals were often separated from family members or in desperate need of medical care in the West. While the impact of these letters is not always clear, on occasion we are fortunate to see results.

Last year I sent a letter to Soviet leaders, cosigned by 35 of my colleagues, requesting that Soviet citizens Evgeny and Galina Kluzhner be allowed to emigrate. We expressed our concern that their emigration application had been met with reprisals against them.

Only a few months later, the Kluzhners received permission to emigrate to Israel. Whether our letter was instrumental in gaining this approval we will never know. However, we do know that letters such as these are a source of inspiration to Soviet Jews and they may, in fact, persuade Soviet officials to consider cases they might otherwise ignore.

Individual cases such as the Kluzhners are the heart and soul of the movement to sustain and support Soviet Jewry.

This week I wrote another letter to General Secretary Gorbachev on behalf of a celebrated Soviet refusenik family: Lev Furman, Marina Furman, and their daughter Aliyah.

On December 6, 1987, while 200,000 people filled The Mall in our Nation's Capital to express our solidarity with Soviet Jewry, Lev and Marina Furman, with their baby daughter, tried to demonstrate in front of the city hall in Leningrad. Even as we joined in the demonstration here in Washington, the Furman family—baby carriage and all—were forced into a car by the KGB for alleged "hooliganism" and taken to the nearest militia headquarters. Marina and Aliyah were detained for several hours, then released after paying a fine. Lev was jailed for 10 days before being released from custody.

Lev Furman requested an exit visa in 1974 but was originally refused permission to emigrate on the basis of his supposed access to "state secrets." He and Marina have applied on several occasions. Although his father Michael has been granted permission to emigrate, Lev, Marina, and Aliyah are still awaiting their visas. The Furmans are constantly subject to harassment and reprisals but refuse to be intimidated. They will not give up.

Calling refuseniks who tried to demonstrate for the right to emigrate "a wretched handful of renegades," a TASS English-language broadcast the day after the Furmans' arrest defended Soviet emigration policies and charged that "opponents of the relaxation in international relations" plan to turn the "speculative aspect of human rights such as emigration into a barrier to the normalization of East-West relations." The report cited Gorbachev's remark, during a television interview in the United States, that there are no reasons other than state security to deny Soviet citizens permission to emigrate. The TASS

broadcast further went on to claim that applications for exit visas are shrinking and that in "several hundred" cases, persons granted the visa changed their mind and refused to leave.

The bitter truth is that in December Soviet Jews, given impetus by the release of several celebrated long-term refuseniks, requested invitations from Israel in greater numbers than at any time during the year.

Soviet Jews are realists. Despite the outpouring of 200,000 Americans on The Mall last December, the outlook for 1988 is grim. We need only notice the contrast between the throng of people in the shadow of the Capitol and the little band of courageous protesters before the Leningrad City Hall.

The "End of the Year Editorial" in the "Refusenik Update" Union of Councils for Soviet Jews—January 8, 1988—concludes that while the week of December 6, 1987, marked a major turning point for the Soviet Jewry movement, this new year 1988 calls for revised assumptions and new strategies:

The historic outpouring of almost a quarter of a million American demonstrators to Washington to demand freedom for Soviet Jews was a powerful mandate. But, as the week of the summit went on, it became clear that merely "raising" the human rights issue by the American people, segments of the American press, and the administration is insufficient to produce any significant movement.

More telling, the prospect of a 1987 summit clearly failed to persuade the Soviets, during 1987, that the American price for improved relations would depend on high and sustained levels of Jewish emigration. The modest increase in exit visas this past year (8,155) is in stark contrast to the comparable period of warming relationship in the late 1970's that culminated, in 1979, in the emigration of more than 51,000 Soviet Jews. Indeed, our government fostered the impression that expanded trade would be high on the United States' agenda irrespective of progress in the field of emigration or Soviet failure to comply with the Helsinki accords and other human rights agreements. This signal to the Soviets was made evident by the involvement of the U.S. Department of Commerce in facilitating Gorbachev's meeting with leading American industrialists on the last day of the summit.

Most important * * * for the first time, the Soviets began to strictly enforce the first degree relative invitation limitation. Without much question they are signaling a firm bar to application by the vast majority of the 400,000 Jews wishing to emigrate.

Accordingly, as we face 1988 and beyond, the UCSL will continue to develop and press for more active intervention and linked negotiation on behalf of Soviet Jews both by our government and by the very Americans who demonstrated their commitment on December 6 in Washington. We call upon the Department of State, and the Congress, to work with us in developing more effective economic tools for negotiating improved Soviet human rights performance, and ask the business community as well, to recall that they and their stockholders are Americans, committed by tradition and law to human rights.

We hold that U.S. Government insistence upon credible and direct linkage in the area of human rights be *sine qua non* for enhanced relationships in the fields of cultural, scientific, medical, legal, sister cities, and similar exchange program.

In the final analysis, it will be the grassroots commitment of the American public to the moral imperatives of human rights and Soviet Jewish emigration that will assure that appropriate considerations of linkage are applied to the dangerous and vital circumstances of Jews in the Soviet Union.

(Quoted from "An End of the Year Editorial" by Pamela B. Cohen, National President, and Micah H. Naftalin, National Director, in "Refusenik Update," Jan. 8, 1988, Union of Councils for Soviet Jews, Washington, D.C.)

Mr. Speaker, I would reiterate the excellent suggestion of the UCSJ editorial that a new strategy is needed in 1988 to develop and press for more active intervention and linked negotiation on behalf of Soviet Jews by the United States.

It is not enough merely to raise the issue of human rights. We hope that appeals on behalf of individuals are instrumental in persuading Soviet officials to consider cases they might otherwise ignore. Demonstrations of public support for Soviet Jews are likewise influential in protesting human rights abuses in the Soviet Union. Our Nation supports the granting of full rights for Jews in the Soviet Union to learn their language, to practice their religion and, if they wish, to emigrate freely in accordance with standards of international law. However, these expressions of solidarity and support will be most effective when linked with negotiations regarding arms control and trade agreements between the United States and the Soviet Union.

The crucial importance of this strategy was stressed in the testimony of recent emigre and former refusenik Vladimir Lifshitz before the Helsinki Commission on December 4, 1987:

Soviet officials will try to bargain with the United States in different areas and only to this end will they address human rights. They are not now, nor will they be, sensitive to human rights issues without linkage to trade and arms control.

The winds of change are blowing in the Soviet Union and in East-West relations. While we welcome the spirit of openness, it is clear that glasnost has not yet reached Jews in the U.S.S.R.

A crucial "litmus test" of rhetoric about glasnost and peace is the Soviet Union's policy in regard to its Jewish population.

CONTRA AID

HON. JOEL HEFLEY

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1988

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, last week, Congress took a negative step toward achieving peace in Central America as the President's request for \$36 million in aid to the Nicaraguan freedom fighters was defeated by a vote of 219 to 211.

I am deeply disappointed in the final outcome of the Contra aid vote not only because it reveals Congress' failure to recognize the situation in Nicaragua, but because we have managed to completely damage our worldwide credibility by proving we are not a good

friend to those in desperate need of our help. When you extend the hand of friendship to another, implicit in that is the commitment that you will try to help in times of need. The United States is developing the reputation of extending our hand and then jerking it back. We can't be depended on.

We all want to see peace in Central America. Pulling the rug out from underneath those striving for peace and freedom, however, is not the best method of achieving this goal.

For the past several months, Nicaraguan President Daniel Ortega has appeared increasingly willing to discuss peace. His motives for doing so, though, are born in the hope of avoiding bringing the issue of aid before Congress for a vote. Now that the issue has come up, and we've voted against providing any form of aid, there is absolutely no reason for Ortega to continue pursuit of a peace plan.

Despite all of his talk about peace, Ortega is still arresting and torturing people, he still has custody of at least 6,000 political prisoners, he has admitted to supporting the guerrillas in El Salvador, and he admits to plans for developing a 600,000-man army. Not only that, he has struck a deal with the Soviet Union to obtain even more Migs and tanks.

Does that sound like a man committed to peace and freedom?

On the other hand, the Contras have been receiving more and more support from the Nicaraguan citizens and have had a tremendous impact recently in pressuring the Sandinistas toward the peace process. But rather than help them realize their goal of peace, we're pulling out.

It is now just a matter of time before the nine commandants of the Sandinista government, who are hardcore Communists, solidify their hold on Nicaragua and begin looking to their neighbors, such as Costa Rica. And when their neighbors cry for help from the United States against a Communist takeover, will we turn our backs on them as well?

Costa Rica has no army and will rely on us to send Marines if it is threatened by the Sandinistas. I don't want our young people fighting in the jungles of Central America, but this vote in Congress moved us a step closer to that possibility.

There is no question that the Russians and Cubans are in Nicaragua in significant numbers. We can't dispute the over \$100 billion that Russia has poured into that country in the last year, or that Nicaragua has a Communist government seeking to subvert the duly-elected democratic governments of its neighbors. We simply can't overlook the 10,000-foot runway the Soviets are building in Nicaragua which can accommodate their Backfire bombers—bombers which will then be able to reach virtually every city in the United States. If they were serious about peace, why would they need the submarine pens constructed by the Soviets?

It is clear that the Soviets are not involved in Nicaragua in order to develop better trade relations with the West. They are there to create a Communist outpost in Central America. History has shown how the Soviet Union has used Cuba as a surrogate to further its

goal of global communism. We can assume Nicaragua would play the same role.

The people of Nicaragua have no true freedoms—no freedom of the press, no freedom of religion, no freedom of assembly, or the freedom to criticize their government. Yet, we continue to ignore the pleas of a people crying out for help.

We scream about the civil rights violations in South Africa. How can we continue to ignore the cruel, blatant civil rights violations which occur daily in Nicaragua? We can't talk of peace without also talking of freedom. Our own revolution was not a peaceful act, but it was worth the effort because of the freedoms it produced. Thank God that in our struggle for freedom we had better friends helping us than we have been to the people striving for freedom in Nicaragua.

UKRAINIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1988

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, January 22, 1988, marked the 70th anniversary of Ukrainian independence. Unfortunately, this freedom was short-lived as the Russians took over the Ukraine in 1923; only 5 short years after they had won their independence.

Today, though the Ukraine has its own constitution, and its own government, its people do not have the freedom to decide their own fate as a nation. These decisions are instead made in Moscow, in the Soviet Union.

The Ukrainian people have suffered great losses under Soviet rule. The history of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic has been marked by repeated executions, deportations, political incarcerations, and famines. The Soviet Union has continually tried to destroy the nationalism of the citizens of the Ukraine. But though they have suffered countless times, Ukrainian national pride and spirit has not been dimmed.

The strength and pride of the Ukrainian people could not be more apparent than in the survival of Christianity in the Communist ruled nation. This 70th anniversary of Ukrainian independence is especially important since it also marks the millennium of Christianity in the Ukraine. The Soviet Union has used all means to destroy free religious worship in the Ukraine, but the Ukrainian Catholic, and the Ukrainian Orthodox churches have managed to survive this fate.

The people of the Ukraine are still hoping to bring back a democratic Ukrainian National Republic. They want to preserve their own culture, and live freely and independently, without fear of the harsh Soviet Government. I commend this spirit and join them in their call for freedom.

The United States, this year, is celebrating the 200th anniversary of its Constitution. Let us look forward to the day when the Ukrainians can celebrate a truly democratic constitution openly and freely.

DOLLHOUSE AND MINIATURE COLLECTING—PART OF AMERICAN CULTURE

HON. ROBERT C. SMITH

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1988

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow I will introduce a commemorative resolution to recognize the week of October 9, 1988, as "National Dollhouse and Miniature Week," and I would like to encourage my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to a hobby that dates back to our Nation's colonial days.

This pastime has grown tremendously in popularity among collectors and remains an ideal family activity. Today, about 10 percent of our population has some involvement with dollhouse and miniature collecting, according to the Miniatures Industry Association of America. Collectors communicate with each other and learn more about their hobby through four trade journals that are distributed to all corners of the country.

Dollhouse and miniature collecting is a hobby our children can embrace. It is a wholesome activity that encourages creative use of the imagination. In 1987, several States—including my home State of New Hampshire—declared their own Dollhouse and Miniature Week in October to commemorate this pastime so important to our culture. During this week, various dollhouse and miniature exhibits were displayed in several States.

Again, I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this resolution to recognize the thousands of miniature collectors across the United States who have carried on an important American tradition.

NATIONAL FHA/HERO WEEK

HON. WILLIAM H. NATCHER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1988

Mr. NATCHER. Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege to join with the 300,000 members of the Future Homemakers of America as they celebrate FHA/Hero Week with the theme "Future Homemakers of America: Leaders on the Move."

The Future Homemakers of America believes youth can make a difference in the home, at school, and in the community. For over 40 years FHA/Hero members have been aware, concerned, and doing something about serious issues confronting teens—issues such as drug and alcohol abuse, AIDS prevention, fitness and nutrition, peer pressure, and suicide. Chapter projects help members develop their leadership potential, family communication, career awareness and community spirit. This longstanding commitment to community service helps FHA members become "leaders on the move"—responsible citizens making a difference.

Also, 1987 was a busy and exciting year for FHA members and their advisers. Nearly 2,000 student members and advisers attended the National Leadership Meeting in Washing-

ton, DC. At this meeting three programs were unveiled. "Financial Fitness" is a peer education program designed to help teens develop financial planning and money management skills they can use now and throughout their lives. "Leaders at Work in Food Service" is a program that enhances leadership skills in teens while on the job. Participants develop projects around one of four basic leadership skills: interpersonal, managerial, communication and entrepreneurial. "The 1988 Nutra-Sweet Giving It 100% Award for Community Service" enables chapters to turn their community concerns into action. It is an opportunity for members to put their leadership and vocational home economics skills to work for others while reaping recognition. There will be national and State winners with cash prizes awarded.

This past fall over 6,700 students and advisers attended cluster meetings, which are a series of regional weekend conferences held in St. Louis, Albany, Atlanta, Denver, and Milwaukee. Cluster meetings are offered to enable more local students and teachers the opportunity to receive high quality training.

There were 11,256 FHA members in Kentucky during 1987-88 in 256 chapters. Fifteen hundred members were in the Second Congressional District, which I have the privilege of representing in the Congress of the United States. Sixty-six members and advisers from Kentucky attended the 1987 National Leadership Conference, and I certainly enjoyed meeting with members of the Kentucky delegation while they were in Washington, DC. Twelve hundred members and advisers attended the 1987 State meeting, which was held in Owensboro. The theme of this meeting was "Future Homemakers of America—Voices of Tomorrow."

Two of the Kentucky association officers reside in the Second Congressional District. Deanna Durham, the 1987-88 president, attends Larue County High School in Hodgenville. Robbie Evans, the 1987-88 State secretary, attends Franklin-Simpson High School in Franklin.

A new project—"Global Connections"—is being emphasized in Kentucky. This project focuses on the needs of the underprivileged and underdeveloped areas at home and abroad.

The Future Homemakers of America is an excellent organization. I want to commend all of the members and advisers for their continued commitment to community service, and to wish them continued success in all their future endeavors.

NATIONAL SALUTE TO HOSPITALIZED VETERANS WEEK

HON. W.J. (BILLY) TAUZIN

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1988

Mr. TAUZIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of hospitalized veterans in Louisiana and the rest of the Nation. The week of February 8-14 has been designated a "National Salute To Hospitalized Veterans Week." This is an ideal opportunity for us to express

our gratitude to and honor those who have participated in—and survived—the wars which this country has fought.

The Salute To Hospitalized Veterans Week had four goals: First, to pay tribute and express appreciation to the thousands of hospitalized veterans; second, to promote a continuing awareness of the patriotism of these Americans; third, to increase community awareness of the role of VA medical centers, and fourth, to encourage Americans of all ages to join the faithful volunteers who serve in VA medical facilities throughout the Nation.

In observance of this week, I encourage all Americans to visit their local veterans medical facility to let our veterans know that we have not and will not forget them. We remember their courage and the tremendous sacrifices they made for the United States.

They responded when needed with unflinching spirit and fought courageously in the name of freedom and liberty. They understood that democracy is a challenge and not a gift. Their efforts earned the United States the status of being the freest and one of the most prosperous countries in the world.

Unfortunately, freedom does have a price; one that our veterans have paid. Many paid the ultimate price—life itself. Others were left to carry the cross of illnesses and handicaps.

We must continue to honor and care for our Nation's veterans. Their determination and spirit serve as symbols of strength and provide the cornerstone for peace.

It is with great pride that I recognize this week and the men and women it honors.

IN DEFENSE OF TELEPHONE SUBSCRIBERS

HON. JOHN BRYANT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1988

Mr. BRYANT. Mr. Speaker, too many times in the past few years, the Federal Communications Commission has adopted major changes in communications policy without first thoroughly examining the impact of those changes on the public. In the case of subscriber line charges, we intervened to prevent the Commission from going forward with a plan that could have doubled local telephone rates. In other cases, such as children's television, the FCC's ideologically driven revisions to long-standing policies have been struck down by the courts because they are "arbitrary and capricious" or because there was not an adequate basis of facts to support such revisions.

Unfortunately, by the time the courts act to reverse arbitrary actions by the Commission, the policies are often already in effect and the public has been harmed.

The Commission is currently considering the substantial revision in the way it reviews the rates proposed by the dominant communications common carriers. Rather than review tariffs to ensure that they are "just and reasonable," the Commission would establish a price ceiling and allow dominant carriers to set their rates at any level up to that ceiling. However, prices at the ceiling could result in a return far

in excess of a reasonable level for a regulated company with market power. Prices set below the ceiling might not recover the costs of providing service, placing competitors at an unfair disadvantage and forcing customers of other services offered by a dominant carrier to pay higher-than-necessary rates to make up the difference.

Given the significance of this proposal, one would think that the Commission would have thoroughly justified and explained it. Unfortunately, that is not the case. The Commission claims that the current method of regulation imposes costs on carriers and consumers, but without any factual backup for that claim. It asserts that consumers will benefit from the new proposal, but without demonstrating those benefits by clear and convincing evidence. It has not even published the rules it would adopt to implement the proposal.

Mr. Speaker, such an important change in the way telephone service is priced must be given a complete airing before it is adopted. The FCC has not done so. For this reason, I am today introducing this legislation. This bill would terminate the Commission's current efforts to substitute "price caps" for cost-of-service regulation. The Commission would be barred from beginning another proceeding that would alter the rules and methods used to regulate the rates charged by dominant carriers until January 1, 1989.

I do not mean to imply, Mr. Speaker, that everything about the current regulatory scheme is perfect. If the Commission continues to believe that revisions in the regulation of dominant carriers' rates are necessary, my bill does not prevent the agency from opening an inquiry on the subject and collecting hard data in preparation for a new rulemaking. To safeguard consumers and encourage the continued development of competition, however, the bill requires that any new rulemaking proposal must contain the complete text of any new rules and be accompanied by quantitative data that demonstrates by clear and convincing evidence that all telephone consumers will obtain comparable or better service at lower rates than under the current system of regulation.

My bill will permit the FCC to discharge its responsibilities to review its rules and revise those rules that no longer serve the public interest. At the same time, it will ensure that the process by which those revisions are made protects the public from policies based less on facts than on ideology. I urge my colleagues to support it.

WELCOME TO OUR NEWLY NATURALIZED CITIZENS

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 8, 1988

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with sincere pleasure that I take this opportunity to congratulate the residents of New York's 22d Congressional District who have chosen to become citizens of the United States with all the privileges, freedoms, and responsibilities that American citizenship entails.

Our beautiful Hudson Valley region in New York State is proud of its newest citizens and I invite my colleagues to join me in welcoming the following newly naturalized Americans, extending to them our best wishes for a happy and prosperous life in their new homeland:

Martha Ramona Abreu, Ryszard Adamiak, Sophia Adams, Antonio Adria, Maria Agapito, Geoffrey Agard, Kunsoo Ahn, Marie Francoise Desroches Alcin, Roger Almirol, Anella Alois, Howard Anderson, Pietro Anselmo, Reuven Appel, Rollin Aurelien, Jr., Rollin Aurelien, Behnam Bagheri, Gene Jay Beauvoir, Orlando Florendo Begonia, Rivka Liba Binefeld, Moshe Binefeld, Eric Ireneusz Blachno, Bienvenida Magboo Bofetiado, Seweryn Bojmal, Miriam Milady Bomparrito.

Pearl Winsome Booth, Izemene Borno, Nora Bou, Chaim Carl Bronstein, Tsyvia Sylvia Bronstein, Rosa Yleana Cabrera, Emylyn Ordenez Cacho, Edwin Ordenez Cacho, Carole Cambronne, Anna Maria Carl, Maria del Carmen Lopez Cespedes, Nancy Chan, Chung Cha Chang, Mao-Ching Chang, William Chao-Yu Kwan.

George Cheng-Hong Hsu, Sion Cohen, IsmeJeanne Colin, Rod Crespo, Jozef Stanislaw Czyn, Fernande Daniel, Louis Milot Dardignac, Maria Virginia Fonacier De Leon, Odete De Sousa C Valentim, Carlos Enrique Del Pozo, Eltise Desir, Seneida Diaz, Etya Dobruskina, Herminia Sanglay Dominon, Evans Dorcean, Therese Aubin Draper, William Anthony Draper, Edith Dubuisson, Turguad Dubuisson, Napoleon Adviento Dural, Fernando Ong Dy.

Sislyn Constantia Dyke, Winston Stanley Dyke, Shirian Ivy Earle, Barry Einhorn, Gloria Escobar, Emilius Etinne, Maria Magdalena Fedorow, Alexander Fishbeyn, Mikhail Fishbeyn, Riva Fishbeyn, Benito Antonio Flores, Marina Flores, Wilfreda Corpuz Fontanilla, Sharon Margaret Francis, Chaim Friedland, Mertella Elizabeth Frison, Gai Galitzine, Aleykuty George, Dominique Benoit Gillet, Nicola Giliberto, Bracha Golander.

Yechiel Golander, Rifka Mindy Goldberg, Bety Greenspon, George Wilberforce Grizzle, Gittel Gruber, Eugenia Gurevich, Josefina America Gutierrez, Rose Carole Harding, Joseph Hartman, Malka Hayut, Shlomo Annon Hayut, Paul Hervold, Elvia Veronica Higinio, Nadra Tahir Husain, Adolfo Hernaldo Ibarra, Nubia Marina Ingersoll, Ilrick Shamar Isaac, Josef Isrol, Marie Carmel Jacques, Christopher Jadcak, Moise Jankovits.

Markess Joseph Jean-Charles, Gilberte Jean-Francois, Joseph Finance Jean-Marc, Guymard Jean, Maria Consuelo Gil Jimenez, Cesar Augusto Jondee, Brunia Joseph, Moo Woong Jun, Candida Jusl, Salah Mohamed Ibrahim Khalil, Stanley Khorosh, Svetlana Khorosh, Philip Youngseon Kim, Sarah Soomi Kim, Yung Chin Chou Kou, Padmavathy Kurra, Brunel Joseph Laguerre, Hue Kiem Lam, Vinh Chan Lam, Paulette Ruth Landry, Mary Lane.

Timothy Anthony Lane, Carole Lartique, Caroline Meang-Jane Lee, Edward Sung-Soo Lee, Sonny Yong Lee, Terrence Tieh Lee, Yisroal Boruch Leibowitz, Winston Fitz-Hugh Lovell, Su-Fung Ma, Gladys Teresa Martinez, Akhter Moin Matin, Bereta Antionette McNab, Samol Meas, Hadassa Mendelson, Salomon Mermelstein, Aleida Margarita Milbury, Michael Hugh Miller, Carmen Molleda, Maureen Leslie Moolick, Eduardo Ricardo Morales.

George Kuru Naduparambil, Christine Huynh Nguyen, Marc Pierre Nicolas, Khalil

Mohsen Niroomand, Michael Oakman, Adelino Olivo, Filiberto Rafael Ovalles, Julio Luis Padron, Thankamma Samuel Panacherry, Isabel Dora Pastor-Guerrero, Rupal Jayantibhai Patel, Shashikant Patel, Escolastico Pena, Eddy Marie Philippe, Joseph Saint Juste Placide, Etzer Racine, Angela Ramos, Marie Nicole Remy, Carmen Adalgisa Reynoso, Francisca Altagracia Rosario, Frank Henri Ruffin.

Ahmed Mohamed Salha, Marie Dina Salvant, Elizabeth Silvestre San Agustin, Jesus Cristobal Sanchez, Maria Concepcion Dural Santillana, Ricardo Santos, Jr., Heriberto Hill Santos, Sunny Ginley Santos, Concetta Schiavo, Marcel Alvin Service, Jennifer May Shapiro, Mohammad Ghaith Izzat Sharif, Shanthi Ramesh Shenoi, Cho Fong Shiu, Zouart Spenjian, Chana Stern, Marina Elizabeth Anne Streer von Steerwitz Obolensky, Sreng Sun, Ismay Mavis Swammy.

Mark Anthony Swammy, Edmund Tennenhaus, Esther Tennenhaus, Israel Tennenhaus, Eduvigis Altagracia Vega, Gary Volkov, Josephine Anne Wallace, Paul Ainsworth Williams, Susan Lee Woo, Dov Yagel, Melvin Yaphe, Ertan Yuzak, Philippe Zamor, Yong-Suk Zarski, Julia Lopes de Pinho Marreiros.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, February 9, 1988, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

FEBRUARY 10

9:00 a.m.

Foreign Relations

Terrorism, Narcotics and International Operations Subcommittee

To continue hearings to review international drug control programs, focusing on law enforcement and foreign policy in Panama.

SD-419

FEBRUARY 11

9:00 a.m.

Foreign Relations

Terrorism, Narcotics and International Operations Subcommittee

To continue hearings to review international drug control programs, focusing on law enforcement and foreign policy in Panama.

SD-419

FEBRUARY 16

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the status of the space shuttle recovery program.

SR-253

10:00 a.m.

Foreign Relations

To resume hearings on the Treaty Between the United States and the USSR on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (Treaty Doc. 100-11).

SH-216

2:00 p.m.

Select on Intelligence

To resume closed hearings on the provisions of the Treaty Between the United States and the USSR on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (Treaty Doc. 100-11).

SH-219

FEBRUARY 17

9:00 a.m.

Rules and Administration

Business meeting, to consider Senate committee resolutions requesting funds for operating expenses for 1988, S. Res. 41, to provide for germaneness or relevancy of floor amendments, S. Res. 42, to limit legislative amendments to general appropriations bills, S. Res. 43, to establish a procedure in order to overturn the Chair on questions of germaneness under cloture, S. Res. 274, to limit sense of the Senate or Congress amendments, S. Res. 277, to require that amendments must be offered to a bill, resolution, or other measure in the order of the sections of that bill, resolution, or other measure, and other pending legislative and administrative business.

SR-301

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-366

10:00 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

Business meeting, to consider S. 1516, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1988 through 1992 for programs of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA).

SR-332

Environment and Public Works

Environmental Protection Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 1804, to designate the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge in Alaska as wilderness, and related matters.

SD-406

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the Montreal Protocol on Substances That Deplete the Ozone Layer (Treaty Doc. 100-10).

SD-419

Governmental Affairs

To resume hearings to review the implementation of the Presidential Transitions Act of 1963, focusing on ways to eliminate the use of private resources in the transition process and to provide for the orderly transfer of power between administrations.

SD-342

11:00 a.m.

Foreign Relations

Business meeting, to consider the Montreal Protocol on Substances That Deplete the Ozone Layer (Treaty Doc. 100-10), and pending nominations.

SD-419

2:00 p.m.

Foreign Relations

To hold closed hearings on the Treaty Between the United States and the U.S.S.R. on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (Treaty Doc. 100-11).

S-407, Capitol

Select on Intelligence

To continue closed hearings on the provisions of the Treaty Between the United States and the U.S.S.R. on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (Treaty Doc. 100-11).

SH-219

FEBRUARY 18

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-366

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

Environmental Protection Subcommittee Superfund and Environmental Oversight Subcommittee

To hold joint hearings on the implementation of Title I of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act, including issues related to ocean disposal.

SD-406

Foreign Relations

To continue hearings on the Treaty Between the United States and the U.S.S.R. on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (Treaty Doc. 100-11).

SH-216

Small Business

To resume hearings on S. 1993, to improve the growth and development of small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, especially through participation in the Federal procurement process, and H.R. 1807, to set forth specified small business eligibility requirements with respect to the Small Business Administration's small business and capital ownership development program and the award of Government procurement contracts under the small business set-aside program.

SR-428A

2:00 p.m.

Foreign Relations

To continue hearings on the Treaty Between the United States and the

U.S.S.R. on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (Treaty Doc. 100-11).

SH-216

Select on Intelligence

To continue closed hearings on the provisions of the Treaty Between the United States and the U.S.S.R. on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (Treaty Doc. 100-11).

SH-219

FEBRUARY 19

10:00 a.m.

Foreign Relations

To continue hearings on the Treaty Between the United States and the U.S.S.R. on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (Treaty Doc. 100-11).

SH-216

Select on Intelligence

To continue closed hearings on the provisions of the Treaty Between the United States and the U.S.S.R. on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (Treaty Doc. 100-11).

SH-219

2:00 p.m.

Foreign Relations

To continue hearings on the Treaty Between the United States and the U.S.S.R. on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (Treaty Doc. 100-11).

SH-216

FEBRUARY 22

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to review those programs which fall within the jurisdiction of the committee as contained in the President's proposed budget for fiscal year 1989, focusing on the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

SD-406

Special on Aging

To hold hearings on the Social Security "notch" issue, and possible solutions thereto.

SD-628

2:00 p.m.

Office of Technology Assessment

The Board, to meet to consider pending business items.

EF-100, Capitol

FEBRUARY 23

9:00 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to review legislative priorities of the Disabled American Veterans.

SD-106

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1989 for the Department of Agriculture.

SD-138

2:00 p.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Public Lands, National Parks and Forests Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 2042, to authorize the Vietnam Women's Memorial Project, Inc. to construct a statue at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in

honor and recognition of the women of the United States who served in the Vietnam conflict.

SD-366

FEBRUARY 24

9:00 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to review legislative priorities of the Paralyzed Veterans of America, the Blind Veterans Association, the Military Order of the Purple Heart, and the Veterans of World War I.

SR-325

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings on the Federal Reserve's first report on the conduct of monetary policy for 1988.

SD-538

2:00 p.m.

Small Business

To hold hearings on S. 1929, to create a corporation for small business investment.

SR-428A

FEBRUARY 25

8:00 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings on the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 1989 for veterans programs, and proposed legislation relating to veterans' home loan guarantees.

SR-418

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To continue hearings on the Federal Reserve's first report on the conduct of monetary policy for 1988.

SD-538

Environment and Public Works

Environmental Protection Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1979, to establish the Grays Harbor National Wildlife Refuge in the State of Washington.

SD-406

Finance

To hold hearings on the nomination of Mark Sullivan, of Maryland, to be General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury.

SD-215

2:00 p.m.

Environment and Public Works

Water Resources, Transportation, and Infrastructure Subcommittee

To hold hearings on speed limit issues.

SD-406

Small Business

To resume hearings on S. 1993, to improve the growth and development of small business concerns owned and controlled by socially and economically disadvantaged individuals, especially through participation in the Federal procurement process, and H.R. 1807, to set forth specified small business eligibility requirements with respect to the Small Business Administration's small business and capital ownership development program and the award of Government procurement contracts under the small business set-aside program.

SR-428A

MARCH 1

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1989 for the Department of Agriculture, focusing on the Agricultural Research Service, Cooperative State Research Service, and the Extension Service.

SD-138

MARCH 2

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-366

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to review those programs which fall within the jurisdiction of the committee as contained in the President's proposed budget for fiscal year 1989, focusing on the Environmental Protection Agency.

SD-406

2:00 p.m.

Governmental Affairs

Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1014, to increase civil monetary penalties based on the effect of inflation.

SD-342

MARCH 3

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

Business meeting, to consider President's budget requests for fiscal year 1989 for veterans programs, and proposed legislation relating to veterans' home loan guarantees.

SR-418

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1989 for the Department of Agriculture, focusing on the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Federal Grain Inspection Service, Food Safety and Inspection Service, and the Agricultural Marketing Service.

SD-138

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings on S. 1848, to authorize a Minority Business Development Administration in the Department of Commerce.

SR-253

2:00 p.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Public Lands, National Parks and Forests Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1544, to provide for cooperation with State and local governments for the improved management of certain Federal lands, and H.R. 2652, to revise boundaries of Salem Maritime National Historic Site in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

SD-366

MARCH 8

9:30 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to review legislative priorities of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

SD-106

MARCH 14

10:00 a.m.
Finance
Private Retirement Plans and Oversight of the Internal Revenue Service Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the reform of Internal Revenue Service code penalties.

SD-215

MARCH 15

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1989 for the Department of Agriculture, focusing on Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Soil Conservation Service, and the Commodity Credit Corporation.

SD-138

MARCH 16

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting, to consider pending calendar business.

SD-366

MARCH 17

2:00 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Public Lands, National Parks and Forests Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1508, S. 1570 and H.R. 1548, bills to withdraw and reserve certain Federal lands for military purposes.

SD-366

MARCH 22

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1989 for the Department of Agriculture, focusing on the Foreign Agricultural Service, Food for Peace Program (P.L. 480), Office of International Cooperation and Development, and the Office of the General Sales Manager.

SD-138

MARCH 23

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Aviation Subcommittee
To resume hearings on S. 1600, to create an independent Federal Aviation Administration.

SR-253

Governmental Affairs
Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings to examine how the Federal Government can insure the quality of medical tests performed in clinical laboratories.

SD-342

MARCH 24

9:30 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee

To continue oversight hearings to examine how the Federal Government can insure the quality of medical tests performed in clinical laboratories.

SD-342

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1989 for the Farm Credit Administration.

SD-138

MARCH 30

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1989 for the Department of Agriculture, focusing on the Rural Electrification Administration.

SD-138

MARCH 31

9:00 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold hearings on proposed legislation relating to agent orange and related issues.

SR-418

APRIL 12

9:30 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Ethics in Government Act.

SD-342

APRIL 13

9:30 a.m.
Governmental Affairs
Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee
To continue hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Ethics in Government Act.

SD-342

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1989 for the Department of Agriculture, focusing on the Farmers Home Administration,

and the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

SD-138

APRIL 19

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1989 for the Department of Agriculture, focusing on the Food and Nutrition Service, and the Human Nutrition Information Service.

SD-138

APRIL 21

10:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1989 for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, and the Food and Drug Administration of the Department of Health and Human Services.

SD-138

APRIL 26

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1989 for the Department of Agriculture, rural development, and related agencies.

SD-138

APRIL 27

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1989 for the Department of Agriculture, rural development, and related agencies.

SD-138

APRIL 28

9:00 a.m.
Appropriations
Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1989 for the Department of Agriculture, rural development, and related agencies.

SD-138

CANCELLATIONS

MARCH 16

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Aviation Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on activities of the Federal Aviation Administration.

SR-253